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1. Scope of the procedures

1.1 This Quality Assurance Handbook draws together in a single location the policies, processes and codes of practice which constitute King’s College London Quality, Monitoring and Enhancement framework.

1.2 The information in the Handbook covers:
- the approval, modification, monitoring and review of all undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes and modules, including collaborative provision, specialist doctorates and short credit bearing courses;
- the approval and monitoring of new research degree programmes;
- the Core Code of Practice for PGT research governance and the dissertation framework;
- assessment policies and processes;
- Short Course Policy;
- Intercollegiate Policy;
- Recognition of Prior Learning Policy
- Policy on closing or suspending a programme
- Policy on validation and accreditation

1.3 Proposals for short courses should follow the approval procedures as laid down by the Short Course Policy (see Section H). For short courses that sit outside the Faculty or non-credit bearing short courses these should be submitted via the online Short Course application form (SCAF) which can be found at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/scafeform/auth/login/. For credit-bearing short courses that sit within a Faculty these should be submitted via OPAMA.

2. List of abbreviations

2.1 The following definitions of terms are used throughout the Handbook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module</td>
<td>an individual element of a programme of study which is taught and examined under the approved regulations for that programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>comprises the approved curriculum followed by a student for a specified award upon which the student is registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSC</td>
<td>Academic Standards Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>College Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRB</td>
<td>Professional, statutory or regulatory body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Strategy, Planning and Analytics team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSE</td>
<td>Quality Standards and Enhancement section of the Students and Education Directorate¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDASC</td>
<td>Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSS</td>
<td>Postgraduate Research Student’s Sub-committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEC</td>
<td>Faculty (Institute/School)² Education Committee or equivalent body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITS</td>
<td>acronym for the student record system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/contact.aspx for contact details.
² Throughout the rest of the document referred to as Faculty
3. Quality assurance, regulatory and credit frameworks – national and College

3.1 College procedures are required to take account of the various components of the QAA’s *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*; (see https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code). The code is split into 4 *Expectations* (2x Standards and 2x Quality) and 13 *Core practices* (4x Standards and 9x Quality). The Code also has a set of *Common practices*, but these are not applicable to universities in England, though we endeavour to adhere to them. Additionally there is a set of Advice and Guidance documents to aid us in delivering a robust quality assurance framework.

3.2 A key component of King’s quality assurance framework is the way in which programmes and modules are designed, approved, modified, monitored and reviewed. This process ensures that King’s programmes meet the academic standards set by the university and the external environment, which includes the Office for Students, QAA and the various PSRBs. These standards are then maintained and monitored via the processes of delivery, assessment and review.

3.3 King’s structure and operation is characterised by the devolution to Faculties (Institute/School) of a wide range of responsibilities within a defined framework. The Academic Board, as the principal corporate body with responsibility for assuring quality in the academic work of the university sets the framework and defines the standards and rules to which Faculties must work. It is aided in this task by a sub-structure of committees which develop, agree and monitor the majority of the policies and procedures governing the operation of the framework.

3.4 The relevant part of the Academic Board’s sub-structure concerned with the monitoring and review of programmes and modules is the College Education Committee (CEC) which oversees these procedures and their implementation by Faculties; while the sub-structure of CEC concerned with programme and module approval and modification is the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee (PDASC); and the sub-committee concerned with assessment is the Academic Standards Sub-Committee (ASSC). CEC is also responsible for the oversight of the education strategy of the College.

3.5 In line with the principles of devolution to Faculty Education Committees (FECs), or equivalent bodies, as specified in the Faculty core governance functions, Faculties are responsible for approving and modifying programmes and modules in accordance with the procedures set out in this Handbook. Faculty core governance functions are available at https://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/governancelegal/faculty-governance. FECs are also responsible for collecting Programme Enhancement Plans (PEPs) from departments within their Faculty and for reporting on these as advised by CEC. FECs are also responsible for ensuring that reviews of all programmes within the Faculty are undertaken and for reporting such reviews to the CEC.

3.6 There is one set of generic regulations that apply for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. Programme specific regulatory information is contained within

---

3 Throughout the rest of this document referred to as Faculty
4 Throughout this document the term “Faculty (Institute/School)” also includes the grouping of the English Language Centre, whose governance structures in relation to quality assurance is via the Faculty of Arts and Humanities.
5 For the next two years programme reviews are being suspended while an intensive curriculum review is completed by the College
6 A small number of programmes are not in the credit framework. The full list of awards can be found in the Academic Regulations, G3
7 For 2019/20 a separate set of regulations will exist for the King’s Business School while they pilot the transitional 1st year
programme specifications which therefore have regulatory status. Programme specifications are published only once a year, prior to the start of each session and cannot be amended during a session. Requests for the suspension of regulatory information in a programme specification should follow the same procedure as requests for suspension of the Academic regulations. Further information on the credit framework, associated regulations and level descriptors can be found on the programmes of study web pages at https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/approvalandmod/index

3.7 There may, however, be instances, for example with some professional programmes, where programme specific regulations may be required. In such instances, advice on the necessity for and the production of such regulations should be sought from Quality, Standards and Enhancement team (QSE). These regulations and any subsequent major amendments will require the approval of the Academic Board before the start of the session in which the programme is due to commence, and should be appended to, and form part of, the programme specification.

3.8 Since 2015/16 Programme Information Sheets are provided to all applicants to all programmes where a fee is attached. These information sheets must be submitted by August of each academic year to the admissions team. (see Section B Procedures for programme and module approval and modification).
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Procedures for programme and module approval and modification
1. **Introduction**

1.1 The design and approval process is the quality assurance mechanism by which a proposed programme of study is scrutinised in order to assure Academic Board and Council that the programme meets King’s expectations for quality and academic standards. This process is mandatory for all new undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes at King’s including those delivered through collaborative provision arrangements and by King’s Online unless the proposal meets the specific conditions for the King’s fast track programme approval process (section 10 below).¹

1.2 The College’s annual planning process should identify any new programmes that a Faculty may wish to introduce, and notification of such intended programme approval activity should be submitted by Faculties through the annual reporting mechanism. Notifying PDASC of intended programme approval in this way should ensure that any potential areas for cross-Faculty collaboration are identified at an early stage.

1.3 The approval of a programme is managed in two formal phases with the possibility of a third phase if there is a complex programme being proposed or a programme involving a collaborative provision arrangement. The two formal phases are preceded by an informal initial programme development phase.

1.4 It is expected in all cases that the proposal has, in the first instance, been discussed with and has the support of the relevant Head of Department, Vice Dean (Education) and Executive Dean of Faculty². Proposals also have to be signed off by the relevant territorial Provost. All new programme proposals must be included in the Faculty’s business plan³ and be approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee. In exceptional circumstances where the proposed programme was not included in the business plan, the proposing Faculty must confirm on the programme proposal form how the programme aligns with the business plan.

---

¹ For those programmes going through curriculum refresh (following portfolio simplification) a process is being developed
² The same applies to both faculties where a programme proposal involves more than one Faculty
³ See fast track programme approval process (section 10) for cases where the programme is being developed to respond to the needs of a specific employer and has to be delivered at short notice or the programme is being developed following receipt of external funding and has to be delivered at short notice.
1.5 Where a collaborative programme with a partner institution is being developed which leads to a separate award by the partner, the Faculty Education Committee should confirm with the programme proposer whether the programme also has to be approved through the Partner’s programme approval process and the timescale for completion, including any registration with the appropriate authority.

1.6 **Initial Programme Development Phase**

Informal engagement with a range of stakeholders\(^4\) to

- make them aware of the proposal
- discuss any potential resource implications at an early stage
- discuss programme development\(^5\) and to ensure that considerations about how employability is embedded into the curriculum are addressed from the outset
- discuss the viability of delivering learning opportunities with a collaborative partner by assessing any risks at the outset and establishing risk management strategies. This may involve a review of the risk assessment and due diligence documents by the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee, subject to the collaborative activity.

1.7 During this phase the Programme Leader meets with the Embedding Employability Consultant to discuss what the programme team wants to get out of the Embedding Employability Workshop and to agree the length and scope of the workshop. If the Programme Team would prefer a longer planning/conceptual meeting at this early stage this is also possible. Should the programme team decide in discussion with the Embedding Employability Consultant that they would like to hold the Embedding Employability Workshop before the PPF is submitted, this is possible.

1.8 This initial meeting will enable the facilitator to organise a bespoke workshop which will meet the specific needs of the programme team. In cases where a department is putting forward a number of programmes for approval which share a significant number of modules/have a common first year for example, a single workshop covering all programmes might be possible. Whether or not this would be the best approach will be agreed at the initial discussion.

1.9 Actions required following this engagement will be captured on the Programme Proposal Form.

1.10 Programme Teams will also be given access to the Embedding Employability Toolkit at this initial programme development phase to assist in programme development. This will include examples of documentation from programmes which have already been through the process and been approved and guidance on the programme director’s role in the process.

1.11 **Phase 1**

Initial approval of the proposed programme by the relevant Faculty Education Committee and PDASC, with

- sign-off for admissions, estates and facilities, library, marketing and finance cases
- consideration of the employability context following engagement with Careers and Employability
- consideration of any involvement with King’s Online, Global Mobility or Global Engagement team

---

\(^4\) See 5.9 below for list of stakeholders.

\(^5\) During 2019/20 a King’s Flexible Curriculum Framework will be developed to take into account the new flexible curriculum introduced by Curriculum 2029 (which forms part of the Education Strategy 2017-2022)
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- the Ethical Reputational Risk Review form and any risk assessment process undertaken, for those programmes with collaborative activity (where relevant).

1.12 **Phase 2**
Development of programme and approval by Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent).

1.13 **Phase 3**
Consideration by PDASC of complex proposals and programmes which involve a collaborative provision arrangement

1.14 The main purposes of the process is to ensure that:
- New programme proposals do not overlap significantly with existing programmes elsewhere in the university;
- All new taught provision aligns with King’s Strategic Vision 2029 and with the Education Strategy;
- All new taught provision is academically desirable, viable financially, and in terms of student recruitment;
- The programme takes account of all relevant internal and external reference points;
- Threshold academic standards are met;
- Appropriate student learning opportunities are available;
- Employability is considered at the outset and that embedded employability is clearly articulated in module outlines and programme specifications;
- The information provided to students about their studies is complete with regard to programme content, structure, learning outcomes, modes of assessment, embedded employability and extra-curricular employability opportunities.

2. **Internal and External Reference points**

2.1. In designing a new programme of study, account needs to be taken of a number of internal and external reference points.

**External Reference Points**

**FHEQ**

2.2. All programmes have to be set at one of the levels within the *Frameworks for higher education qualifications* (FHEQ) published by the QAA and demonstrate that they fit the qualification descriptors for each level. The levels and the main qualifications at each level are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Undergraduate Certificates of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Diplomas of Higher Education, Foundation degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degrees with Honours, Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 7</td>
<td>MB BS, BDS, Integrated Masters degrees, Postgraduate Certificates, Postgraduate Diplomas and Masters degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 8</td>
<td>Doctorates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject Benchmark Statements**

2.3. The QAA, in conjunction with the sector, has developed subject benchmark statements based around broad subject groupings which are designed to represent the conceptual
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framework of a discipline and to provide information about the understanding and employability skills acquired through the study of that discipline. Subject benchmark statements need to be considered in the design of a new programme. For some programmes more than one benchmark statement may be relevant and for others there may not be any statements of direct relevance.

Characteristics Statements

2.4. QAA has also produced a qualification benchmark for Foundation Degrees, which is not specific to any particular discipline but which sets out a generic framework for Foundation Degrees that serves as a reference point for use in programme design, delivery and review. Additionally there are guidance notes on Master’s degree characteristics, Doctoral degree characteristics, Qualifications Involving More than One Degree Awarding Body and a new Higher Education in Apprenticeships Characteristics Statement.

PSRBs

2.5. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) are a very diverse group of professional and employer bodies, regulators and those with statutory authority over a profession or group of professionals. PSRBs engage with higher education as regulators. They provide membership services and promote the interests of people working in professions; accredit or endorse courses that meet professional standards, provide a route through to the professions or are recognised by employers. King’s currently works with 24 PSRBs across 90 programmes.

Internal Reference Points

2.6. In addition to the external framework within which programmes have to be constructed, the following internal reference points should also be taken into account as part of the process:

- Strategic Vision 2029;
- Education Strategy;
- International Strategy;
- Faculty Education Strategy (where one exists);
- Widening Participation Strategy;
- Strategy for Enhancing Student Employability (note new strategy under development);
- Equality and diversity policies;
- Academic Regulations including the criteria for degrees;
- Credit Framework;
- the views of students;
- the underpinning of joint honours programmes by a clear intellectual rationale, either educational or academic defined in the following terms:

  o an educational rationale applies to instances whereby the components of a joint honours degree, without necessarily overlapping at subject level, nonetheless provide the student with a greater breadth of complementary learning outcomes and thereby a more rounded education than afforded by a single honours degree;
  o an academic rationale applies to combinations where there is a significant overlap between the two subject areas in terms of knowledge and expertise and where studies in one component thereby shed light on studies in the other to enhance the student’s understanding of both.

3. Programme design

3.1. Faculties should contact King’s Academy if they require any assistance or advice about programme design. The design of a new programme should identify the following:

- intellectual coherence of the programme;
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- level of the programme within the *Frameworks for higher education qualifications*;
- overall credit value;
- aims and objectives;
- content, structure, distinctive features;
- learning outcomes with reference to any relevant subject benchmark statements;
- learning outcomes with reference to embedded employability;
- the option to include a period of real world experience\(^6\) in the programme where this is not already an integral part of the proposal;
- opportunities to embed research skills into the curriculum;
- opportunities to embed a global dimension into the curriculum and/or to include the option of student mobility (for example period abroad, attending conference overseas);
- associated modules and whether or not any are introductory, compulsory, core, optional, professional practice, prerequisites, co-requisites or excluded combinations and the combination of levels of credit allowed within the overall credit for the programme\(^7\);
- relevant co-curricular Careers and Employability workshops or programmes which will complement the embedded employability within the programme;
- teaching pattern and modes of delivery to include the embedding of technology enhanced learning;
- guidance on how Inclusive Practices can be implemented within teaching and assessment;
- opportunities for interdisciplinary learning;
- assessment methods and how these allow students to achieve the learning aims and outcomes and how they assess embedded employability. Cognisance should be taken of the advice and guidance published by the QAA entitled *Assessment*;
- identification of nested awards (i.e. a lower level and/or volume award which students may register for) and identification of exit awards (e.g. an award available to a student unable to meet the credit volume and/or credit level requirements for the award on which they are registered). A programme that does not wish to offer an exit award must seek prior permission from ASSC first;
- consideration of how the teaching pattern, content, mode of delivery and assessment methods allow for equality of opportunity for academic achievement;
- variations in practice in notional learning, credit transfer and levels/volumes of award with international partners (where relevant)
- for Masters’ programmes, alignment of the dissertation/research project element with College guidelines (see *Core code of practice for PGT research governance and dissertation framework*).

3.2 This process culminates in the production of a programme specification which forms the basis of programme approval documentation. Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms can be found [here](#) in the Quality Handbook.

4. **Externality**

4.1 It is necessary for proposals for new programmes to undergo specialist external input/review; this must be evidenced in the programme approval documentation. At the development stage of a new programme, departments identify a suitable external specialist. The role of the external specialist is to provide expert subject advice at the design stage of a new programme. The specialist can be an academic, or a member of a professional, statutory or regulatory body. It is possible to use a current External Examiner from another King’s programme for this purpose, however, it is not appropriate for the same External Examiner to then be engaged in the capacity of External Examiner for the new programme until a period of three academic years has elapsed.

---

\(^6\) For example, work placement, experiential learning, live projects, volunteering.

\(^7\) Final definitions of status of module still to be approved
4.2 External peers will be expected to take an overview of the approval process and to ensure that appropriate attention is given to the setting and maintenance of academic standards during this process. The external peer will be asked to sign-off the final programme approval documentation. Guidance for Faculties on the use of external specialists and external peers for programme approval and review can be found in the Quality Assurance Handbook.

4.3 Employer input into the development of new programmes is also required. For programmes that are not governed by PSRB requirements, the specific approach should be discussed by the Faculty and Careers and Employability who will liaise with external employer partners as part of the informal development phase.

5. Development of a new programme proposal

5.1 All new programme proposals must be included in the Faculty’s business plan and be approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee. In exceptional circumstances where the proposed programme was not included in the business plan, the proposing Faculty must confirm on the programme proposal form how the programme aligns with the business plan.

5.2 It is expected in all cases that the proposal has, in the first instance, been discussed with and has the support of the relevant Head of Department, Vice Dean (Education) (via the Faculty Education Committee) and Executive Dean of Faculty (who may delegate approval). Proposals also have to be signed off by the relevant territorial Provost. For those proposals with involvement from another faculty, both faculties must demonstrate their support for the proposal.

Business plan and marketing

5.3 Whilst the academic rationale and quality of a programme should remain the most important factors in the consideration of a new programme, Faculties’ strategic and operational planning will be greatly assisted by a business plan accompanying all new programme proposals. The business plan will indicate how the resources to support the programme will be provided.

5.4 Programme proposers are expected to send the completed Programme Proposal Form, including the marketing template, to the Executive Dean of Faculty (or nominee) and the Director of Marketing (or nominee) so that marketing support can be agreed with the Executive Dean of Faculty.

5.5 Those programmes that require new staffing resources, the proposal proposer should discuss with Faculty Education Leads and Territorial Vice-Principals the resource required and then requests should be submitted as part of the annual Planning Round. Deadlines for such requests are aligned to the Planning Round and Faculties’ strategic reviews with individual deadlines set for each of the Faculties. All requests should be completed by December each year. The role of PDASC will be to only approve the programme based on academic merit – any staffing requests alongside the programme proposal is not in PDASC’s remit to approve.

5.6 The Marketing Department is responsible for presenting and advising on marketing strategies for each Faculty. Guidance should be sought from Faculty marketing officers when proposing a programme to ensure appropriate information is provided in the Marketing Report to PDASC to enable the Committee to make a full decision. Programmes must not be advertised until final approval has been granted by either the Faculty or PDASC (depending on the complexity of the programme).
5.7 Consideration should also be given to the planning and marketing of modules for the Study Abroad market. Further advice should be sought from the Marketing Department.

**Initial programme development**

5.8 A programme proposal is usually initiated and developed within the Faculty and should be consistent with the Faculty strategic development plan.

5.9 Faculties must ensure that the following are consulted and have direct input into the proposal:
- Quality, Standards and Enhancement *(as and when required)*
- Library (including Skills Support)
- Marketing
- Finance
- Careers and Employability
- Global Mobility team (to consider the option of student mobility)
- Employers \(^8\)
- Estates and Facilities

5.10 Faculties should ensure that the following are consulted if required:
- Quality, Standards and Enhancement
- King’s Academy
- Global Engagement (if the intention is to run a programme with an international university)
- Global Mobility (if the intention is to offer study abroad)
- Collaborative links
- Contacts in industry
- King’s Online (if the intention is to create a wholly online programme)
- Centre of Technology Enhanced Learning (CTEL)
- King’s Entrepreneurship Institute
- English Language Centre

**Programme structure**

5.11 The offering of nested awards i.e. a lower volume award which shares some of the same learning aims and outcomes of a larger volume award should be considered. For example, a Master’s degree may offer a nested award of a postgraduate diploma and/or postgraduate certificate which would allow the student to leave after completing the PgDip or PgCert or to progress onto the Masters qualification. In all such cases nested awards are regarded as separate programmes onto which students can be directly recruited. Students register for nested awards (unlike exit awards) and may progress from a nested award on to the ‘higher’ award (but do not then receive both awards).

5.12 Where programmes include pathways, nested awards and exit awards, the statements of programme learning aims and outcomes for each separate award available must be made clear on the programme specification.

5.13 The credit value of core, compulsory, elective or optional modules shall be a multiple of 15 credits for both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The minimum credit value for a module forming part of a programme of study as a core, compulsory, elective or optional

---

\(^8\) Careers and Employability can work with programme teams to facilitate employer input into the initial programme development phase.
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module shall be 15 credits. Credit values of 60 and 120 (MRes only) are also available for postgraduate programmes for dissertations/projects.

5.14 5 and 10 credit modules can be developed for CPD/Executive Education purposes and a combination of modules can lead to a Postgraduate Certificate award. Proposals for the programme should ensure that consideration is made of assessment load to ensure there is no overburdening of students. For a Postgraduate Diploma a combination of 5 or 10-credit modules can be used but there must be in addition a 30-credit research module. For a full Masters programme a 60 credit dissertation (following the College’s Dissertation Framework) must also be included with the 30-credit research methods module.

5.15 Approval to use modules with a different credit weighting must be sought from the College Education Committee.

5.16 Where a programme is jointly awarded with a collaborative Partner, consideration should be given to the recognition of the award level and title within that country’s jurisdiction, particularly where a nested award or an exit award is proposed.

Contact hours
5.17 1 credit = 10 hours of learning, therefore a 15-credit module should have 150 hours of overall student workload including assessments and private study. Where the programme is a collaborative provision arrangement, consideration should be given to the differences in credit value for notional learning hours at the partner HEI and a mapping should be undertaken of the overall student workload against the College’s expectations on notional learning hours.

5.18 The programme team will need to calculate the breakdown of the contact hours detailing the amount of hours assigned to lectures, tutorials, seminars, virtual learning and private study for each module. This information will then be recorded on the module descriptors and be included on Programme Information Sheets.

Assessment methods
5.19 When designing the programme content the programme team will need to consider assessment methods. The assessments undertaken must enable the student to demonstrate achievement of the learning aims and outcomes including employability related learning outcomes.

5.20 Consideration should also be given to the mode of the assessment pattern across the programme of study to ensure students are not being heavily assessed at particular points of the programme.

5.21 Programme teams should consult King’s Academy for advice about assessment. King’s Academy has developed an assessment and feedback online resource. Programme teams can also request a longer workshop to enable them to address a broader range of issues including assessment design.

6 Distance learning, blended learning and e-learning programmes
6.1 Designers of distance learning programmes should consult the advice and guidance produced by the QAA: Learning and teaching and Partnerships.

6.2 Distance learning programmes may also be delivered via e-learning, although the two are not necessarily synonymous. Such provision is often referred to under the heading “flexible and distributed learning” which can be defined as educational provision delivered and/or
supported and/or assessed through means which generally do not require the student to attend particular classes or events at particular times or in particular locations.

6.3 Further guidance and support for development of e-learning programmes can be sought from the Instructional Design and Development team in King’s Online.

7. Collaborative programme activity
7.1 There are separate procedures that govern King’s validation and accreditation of programmes offered by other institutions. However, there are instances when elements of College programmes are delivered away from the main College campuses by bodies external to the College and instances when students undertake activity outside the College for defined periods of time. In these circumstances the process of programme design should give due consideration to the quality assurance aspects of such arrangements to ensure that the academic standards of the programmes are maintained, and that the student experience is not compromised. Reference should be made to guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity, guidance on student placements and definitions of collaborative activity all contained within the Quality Assurance Handbook.

7.2 Approval from PDASC is required before a programme that involves an award being made jointly or separately by the partner can be marketed. As the first stage in the process, the Ethical and Reputational Risk Review form and the Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool should be completed and submitted to the Head of Collaborative Provision for report or consideration by CPSC reporting into CEC (see Section C Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision for further detail). Proportionate risk assessment and due diligence will also be required to confirm the legal status of the proposed partner before outline approval can be given for joint degrees.³

7.3 In cases where an internship or placement learning is to be part of the programme then careful wording around these opportunities needs to be considered when the programme is marketed. If the programme is marketed in a way that leads students to believe the internship or placement learning is automatically provided to them then this will need to be the case.

8 The approval process
8.1 A summary of the approval process in diagrammatic form is given at 9 below.

8.2 Faculties must include new programmes that they want to introduce in the business planning round.

Phase 1
8.3 Proposals for new programmes, including collaborative arrangements, must first of all be approved by: Admissions, Finance, Marketing, Estates and Facilities, and Library, before consideration by the relevant Faculty Education Committee which will consider the Programme Proposal Form (PPF). Final approval by the Executive Dean of Faculty (or their nominee) and territorial Provost must then be sought.

8.4 Proposals for new programmes must then be submitted for approval to PDASC.

8.5 The following documentation is the minimum that PDASC expects to be provided for the initial approval of a programme proposal:

• Programme Proposal Form (PPF);
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- **Marketing case:**
- Information about the employability context following engagement by the programme team with Careers and Employability; As noted in 1.7 above, the Embedding Employability Workshop can be scheduled before the PPF is completed if the programme team, in discussion with the Embedding Employability Consultant, decide that this would be the best approach to inform programme development (see also Phase 2 below). In cases where PDASC requires further work on and resubmission of the PPR, the Embedding Employability Workshop should proceed as originally scheduled.
- The Ethical Reputational Risk Review form and any risk assessment process undertaken, for those programmes with collaborative activity (where relevant).

Programme teams should ensure that they notify Marketing and Finance as soon as possible when a new programme is envisaged in order to allow Marketing and Finance sufficient time to carry out the necessary work on the business and marketing cases.

8.6 PDASC will consider the academic merits, along with the marketing and business case, for the proposed programme and also the employability context and will give approval/not give approval for the programme to be developed and approved by Faculties. If the information provided is insufficient for PDASC to make a final judgement, then the proposal will need to come back for further consideration.

8.7 PDASC approval is only valid for one calendar year. If the programme is not approved within one calendar of PDASC approval, the programme team will have to resubmit the PPF to PDASC.

### Phase 2

8.8 Following approval by PDASC, the Embedding Employability Consultant will organise an Embedding Employability in the Curriculum workshop for the whole programme team. As noted in 1.7 and 8.5 above, the workshop can be scheduled before the PPF is completed if the programme team, in discussion with the Embedding Employability Consultant, decide that this would be the best approach to inform programme development. Workshops will not be a one size fits all model but will be tailored to the requirements of individual programmes including those which have PSRB requirements. In cases where a department is putting forward a number of programmes for approval which share a significant number of modules/have a common first year for example, a single workshop covering all programmes might be possible. The exact approach will have been agreed during initial discussions between the programme team, Careers and Employability and King’s Academy.

8.9 The bespoke workshop will usually last no longer than 2 1/2 hours unless the programme team specifically requests a longer workshop to enable them to address a broader range of issues, for example, assessment design. Workshops will be facilitated by the Embedding Employability Consultant and might include input from King’s Academy. If the programme under discussion is a collaborative provision arrangement, a collaborative provision specialist from Quality, Standards and Enhancement will normally also attend the workshop to provide advice and support. An Embedding Employability Toolkit will be made available to programme teams at initial programme development phase. This will include examples of documentation from programmes which have already been through the process and been approved and guidance on the programme director’s role in the process. The workshop will be an opportunity for the Programme Team to review the programme holistically in terms of how the curriculum and associated assessment enables students to develop skills which will be valued by their future employers.

---

10 The Programme Leader will produce a short statement about the employability context following discussions and in conjunction with the designated member of Careers and Employability.
8.10 A draft programme specification and module outlines will be required in advance of the workshop. Programme teams must ensure that they follow the guidance in the Embedding Employability Toolkit when drafting the documentation.

8.11 The workshop can focus on any one or more of the following, agreed through prior discussion with the facilitator:
- A review of the module outlines and programme specification prepared in advance of the workshop;
- Current intelligence from Careers and Employability about employers’ expectations of employability from graduates of such programmes. This information will be tailored to meet the requirements of individual workshops;
- How employability is embedded in the programme at its current point of development;
- How employers have been involved in the development of the proposal;
- The option to include a period of real world experience\(^\text{11}\) in the programme where this is not already an integral part of the proposal;
- Opportunities to embed a global dimension into the curriculum and/or to include the option of student mobility (for example period abroad, attending conference overseas);
- How PSRB requirements are addressed (where relevant);
- Aims and learning outcomes (including how to write employability learning outcomes);
- How employability is embedded in assessment, the overall assessment strategy, load and timing;
- The alignment of assessment with learning outcomes; the inherent risks to the academic standards and quality of awards when delivering the programme in partnership with another organisation. This would be captured in the areas to consider when completing the Activity Schedule as part of the Memorandum of Agreement;
- Agreement as to any modifications that need to be made to the proposal in the light of the workshop. These would be captured in an action plan and followed up by the programme team in discussion with the workshop facilitator.

8.12 Proposals for new programmes must be submitted for approval to the appropriate Faculty Education Committee.

8.13 To enable decisions to be taken independently of those involved in developing and delivery the programme, Faculty Education Committees should establish programme approval panels which should include as a minimum:
- A Chair, normally the chair of the Faculty Education Committee. In single department Faculties and in cases where the programme being approved is from the same department as the Chair, the Chair of the panel should be from another Faculty;
- A representative from another Faculty (the Chair or a member of the Faculty Education Committee);\(^\text{12}\)
- The external peer(s)\(^\text{13}\)

---

\(^{11}\) For example, work placement, experiential learning, live projects, volunteering.

\(^{12}\) The use of CEC/Faculty Education Committee representatives in this way aids the monitoring of the comparability of standards of programmes of study across the College and assists in the process of quality enhancement through the dissemination of good practice. A list of CEC members is available from the secretary of CEC.

\(^{13}\) The external peers should be different from those who provided input to the design of the programme and will be excluded from subsequently acting as External Examiner for the programme until a period of three academic years has elapsed. The external peer will not necessarily be an expert in the field but will have a broad understanding of the discipline. Their main function is to provide an external viewpoint on the approval process; the specific specialist advice having been provided earlier at the design stage of the process. External peers are appointed by the College for a period of two years in the first instance with the possibility of renewal for a further two years (the process being comparable in many ways to the appointment of External Examiners). Each Faculty requires one or two externals to act in this capacity. The external peer will be expected to attend all programme approval panels; in exceptional circumstances where this is not possible they should provide a written report for the panel. They should also attend at least half of the Faculty Education...
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- a student representative;
- the Faculty Director of Administration or nominee;
- a representative from Careers and Employability.

8.14 In the case of joint degrees within the College or where the teaching of a programme or module is undertaken by more than one Faculty, it is necessary for the proposal to be approved by the Faculty Education Committee of both/all Faculties.

8.15 The following documentation is the minimum that Faculty Education Committees (or their equivalent) can expect to receive. Faculty Education Committees are free to request any information additional to this to fit their own particular requirements.

- A programme approval form;
- Evidence of external input into the design of the programme. This should take the form of a brief report from a subject specialist expert, external to the College together with the programme team’s response to external feedback. The university’s report form template should be used;
- Evidence that issues relating to inclusion, admissions and PSRB requirements have been considered. Information about inclusivity and PSRB requirements should be included in the PAF. A copy of the email correspondence with admissions should be provided;
- Evidence (where required – see 5.10 above) that King’s Academy and CTEL have been consulted for advice about pedagogy and technology enhanced learning;
- Evidence that the views of students in cognate subject areas have been taken into consideration. This should take the form of SSLC minutes or the equivalent mechanism by which student views have been obtained;
- Evidence of engagement with employers (different role to the external peer). This should have been carried out at programme proposal phase and included in the PPF;
- Module approval forms for new modules. Where existing modules are used in a new programme, the learning outcomes of those modules must be made available with the programme documentation. Where a programme makes use of optional modules from outside the department e.g. language modules, then those specific learning outcomes do not need to be made available at approval, but the learning outcomes of the programme must include some generic provision for such modules;
- For programmes delivered as part of a collaborative provision arrangement a draft activity schedule which details out responsibilities for each partner involved in the programme. Where marks awarded by the Partner will be considered as part of a student’s classification award, the schedule of activity should have attached to it the proposed mark translation scheme for the proposed programme, and the arrangements for external examiner oversight;
- Programme Information Sheets (for Competition and Markets Authority purposes when sending out offers);
- The action plan from the Embedding Employability workshop together with evidence of how this has been followed up by the programme team in discussion with the workshop facilitator;

8.16 It is the responsibility of the Faculty Education Committee to ensure that the following have been taken into account before a programme is approved:

Committee meetings each year (see Guidance for Faculties on the use of external specialists and external peers for programme approval and review for further guidance);
14 (please also refer to the Guidance on the design of taught interdisciplinary, joint honours and major/minor programmes in the Quality Assurance Handbook)
15 (see Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms);
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- All resource implications (i.e. for College services outside the Faculty as well as internal Faculty resources)
- The marketing implications in the case of programmes
- Confirmation, if relevant, that the appropriate ethical approval has been sought and granted for modules
- That equality of access and opportunity have been fully considered in the design of the programme
- That advice from an External Specialist has been sought and that there is evidence that the Programme Team has considered and responded appropriately to this advice
- That employability has been embedded across all modules and is expressed in module outlines and the Programme Specification in line with the agreed actions at the Embedding Employability in the Curriculum Workshop
- That for agreements involving collaborative activity with a partner, arrangements will be implemented securely and managed effectively

8.17 The advice of the Executive Dean of Faculty should be sought in cases where Faculty Education Committees are not satisfied that the issues above have been addressed.

8.18 Members of the programme team whose proposal is under consideration must attend the meeting to discuss the proposal.

8.19 In approving programmes and modules Faculties should ensure that their procedures give due consideration to the academic standards of awards and the quality of the learning opportunities available and, where external bodies are involved in the delivery of the teaching, that there are appropriate mechanisms in place to guarantee such standards and quality.

8.20 Faculty Education Committees should ensure that where programmes and modules are approved but with conditions attached, that the fulfilment of those conditions is signed off on the programme approval documentation, reported back to the Faculty Education Committee and documented in Faculty Education Committee minutes. Programmes of study are normally approved for a period of six years unless specified otherwise by the Faculty Education Committee. Re-approval is gained through the process of periodic programme review.

8.21 Following approval by the Faculty Education Committee, the programme documentation and Faculty Education Committee minutes should be forwarded to Quality, Standards and Enhancement. Unless the documentation is submitted in full the programme will not be regarded by the College as being approved. If separate programme regulations are required, these are subject to further approval by the Academic Board and until this has occurred students may not be registered on the programme.

8.22 Quality, Standards and Enhancement scrutinises the documentation to ensure that the information related to quality assurance, approval signatures and regulatory matters is included. For joint/dual awards this includes the completed schedule of activity form and draft Memorandum of Agreement (MoA).

8.23 When Quality, Standards and Enhancement is satisfied that the documentation is complete, they will advise marketing and admissions of the programme approval and the programme details will be added to SITS. A summary report of approved programmes by Faculty will be submitted to PDASC.

16 (see Guidance on risk and ethics assessment in the design of modules of the Quality Handbook for further guidance); 17 Periodic programme review has been suspended for the next two academic years while a full curriculum review is completed by the College. Further details of interim arrangements are noted in Part D of the Handbook.
8.24 When reaching programme readiness stage of development the Embedding Employability Consultant should be included in the Faculty process to ensure that all the employability actions agreed earlier in the programme approval process have been actioned and that a handover can take place to the Faculty Careers Consultant for the ongoing relationship between the programme and King’s Careers and Employability team.

**Phase 3**

8.25 Those programmes that are of a more complex nature e.g. programmes with collaborative provision attached, or those being offered jointly with another Faculty, the Quality, Standards and Enhancement section will forward the submitted programme documentation to PDASC members for final approval. Programme details are added to SITS only after such information has been approved by PDASC and all approval signatures have been gathered. A summary of all approvals is then submitted to College Education Committee.
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9. Diagram of the approval process for new programmes

Seek
Advance discussions of new programmes at planning round meetings

Consult and gain initial approval from:
- Marketing
- Finance
- Careers and Employability
  - Employers
  - Library
  - Estates
  - Global Mobility Team

Seek
Initial approval from:
- Relevant Head of Department
- Vice Dean Education, via Faculty Education Committee
- Executive Dean of Faculty
- Territorial Provost/Senior Vice-Principal

Submit Programme Proposal Form (including business case), marketing case and information about the employability context to PDASC for approval

Design and complete Programme and Module Approval forms taking into consideration and utilising Embedding Employability toolkit:
- QAA Framework for higher education qualifications
- QAA subject benchmark (if applicable)
- College requirements/policies
- Academic regulations
- Requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (if applicable)
- Specialist external input
- Legal and good practice requirements of equality and diversity
- Level in the credit framework
- Aims and objectives
- Content, structure, learning outcomes, including employability outcomes
- Option to include a period of real world experience/student mobility
- Associated modules and status thereof (programmes only)
- Teaching patterns and modes of delivery
- Assessment methods

Seek
Ethical approval if needed for modules

Organise and undertake Embedding Employability Workshop, where the following can be tailored to need:
- Careers and employability embedded into learning outcomes;
- How to write learning outcomes;
- Assessment methods/patterns;
- Embedding collaborative activity to the structure

Submit
all paperwork to FEC/Programme Approval Panel for approval:
- well in advance for new programmes/modules/major modifications
- in good time for minor modifications

QSE check paperwork. Those complex programmes are forwarded to PDASC for final approval; otherwise marketing and admissions advised with PDASC receiving written notification

Following approval by FEC and signing of approval forms, send papers, to include Memorandum of Agreement (if applicable), to QSE
10. **Fast Track Approval Process**

10.1 It is, on occasion, necessary for new programmes to be approved in a shorter timeframe than that demanded by the standard programme approval process. In such cases and where required, there will also be flexibility about the university cut-off point for completing programme approvals.

10.2 The specific criteria which apply to such fast track approvals are listed below. If a new programme proposal does not meet one of the following criteria, the standard programme approval process must be followed. The fast track process cannot be used for collaborative provision arrangements:

- The programme is being developed to respond to the needs of a specific employer and has to be delivered at short notice
- The programme is being developed following receipt of external funding and has to be delivered at short notice

10.3 The proposal must have the support of the relevant Head of Department, Vice Dean (Education) and Executive Dean of Faculty. Proposals also have to be signed off by the relevant territorial Provost.

10.4 The secretary to PDASC and Programme Leader will agree which internal stakeholders from 5.9 above need to be consulted. This will be the minimum that are strictly necessary for the specific proposal.

**Phase 1**

10.5 If a meeting of the relevant Faculty Education Committee isn't imminent, the proposal will be approved by Chair’s action and reported on at the next Faculty Education Committee.

10.6 If a meeting of PDASC isn't imminent the proposal will also be approved by Chair’s action and reported on at the next PDASC. The documentation required for PDASC is as follows:

- **Fast Track Programme Proposal Form (PPF);**
- **Business case**

The Programme Leader should send the Fast Track PPF and business case to the Chair of PDASC at the same time as sending the proposal to the Chair of FEC. This will allow time for the business case to be reviewed. The Chair of PDASC will not, however, approve the proposal until such time as approval from the Chair of the relevant FEC has been received.

**Phase 2**

10.7 The programme team will utilise the embedding employability toolkit to develop the proposal and will send their draft programme specification and module profiles to a designated Embedding Employability Workshop facilitator. The facilitator will review the proposals and provide timely feedback and advice. Only if required following this exchange will a shorter Embedding Employability in the Curriculum Workshop be scheduled.

10.8 The proposal will proceed to a Programme Approval Panel and subsequent approval by Faculty Education Committee in line with the process from 8.12 above. Attendance by Skype is permitted in cases when a member of the panel (for example the external peer) is not able to be present at the university.
11. Diagram of the approval process for fast track new programmes

Consult, with secretary of PDASC to determine if the following need consideration:
- Marketing
- Finance
- Careers and Employability
- Employers
- Library
- Estates
- Global Mobility team

Seek
Initial approval from:
- Relevant Head of Department
- Vice Dean Education
- Faculty Education Committee (via Chair’s Action where applicable)
- Executive Dean of Faculty
- Territorial Provost/Senior Vice-Principal

Submit Fast Track Programme Proposal form and business case to PDASC for approval (Chair’s Action may be taken if applicable)

Design and complete Programme and Module Approval forms using the online toolkit taking into consideration:
- QAA Framework for higher education qualifications
- QAA subject benchmark (if applicable)
- College requirements/policies
- Academic regulations
- Requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (if applicable)
- Specialist external input
- Legal and good practice requirements of equality and diversity
- Level in the credit framework
- Aims and objectives
- Content, structure, learning outcomes, including employability outcomes
- Option to include a period of real world experience/student mobility
- Associated modules and status thereof (programmes only)
- Teaching patterns and modes of delivery
- Assessment methods

Seek Ethical approval if needed for modules

Submit programme and module paperwork to workshop facilitator.
Facilitator will provide timely feedback and where required will organise a shorter workshop to consider those areas needed to be worked on.

Submit all paperwork to FEC/Programme Approval Panel for approval

QSE check paperwork. Those complex programmes are forwarded to PDASC for final approval; otherwise admissions advised with PDASC receiving written notification

Following approval by FEC and signing of approval forms, send papers to QSE
12. Design and Approval of Individual Modules as part of or outside of the programme approval process

12.1 This section of the process applies to individual modules created as part of or outside of the formal programme approval process.

12.2 The design and approval of individual modules ensures that all modules meet King’s expectations for quality and academic standards and that the information given to students about the module is complete.

12.3 The internal and external reference points listed in section 2 of the programme approval process above should also be taken into account when individual modules are being designed.

12.4 The design of a new module should identify the following:

- level of the module (FHEQ);
- overall credit value;
- aims and objectives;
- content, structure, distinctive features;
- learning outcomes with reference to any relevant subject benchmark statements;
- learning outcomes with reference to embedded employability-related learning;
- the option to include real world experience in the module where this is not already an integral part of the proposal;
- relevant co-curricular Careers and Employability workshops or programmes which will complement the embedded employability within the module;
- alignment of learning outcomes with agreed level descriptors;
- opportunities to embed employability into the module;
- opportunities to embed research skills into the curriculum;
- opportunities to embed a global dimension into the curriculum;
- mode of delivery to include the embedding of technology enhanced learning;
- opportunities for interdisciplinary learning;
- assessment methods and how these allow students to achieve the learning aims and outcomes and how they assess embedded employability. Cognisance should be taken of the advice and guidance published by the QAA entitled: Assessment;
- whether the module is also available as an option for inbound Study Abroad students or whether it is available for such students in a modified form;
- whether a module contains some kind of physical procedure or administration of questionnaires, conducting interviews or making video or audio recordings. All such activity which involves human participants or raises other ethical issues with potential social or environmental implications must be submitted for ethical review (see Guidance on risk and ethics assessment in the design of modules and the research ethics web pages);
- for Masters’ programmes, alignment of the dissertation/research project element with College guidelines (see Core code of practice for PGT research governance and dissertation framework).

12.5 Consideration should also be given to the planning and marketing of modules for the inbound Study Abroad market. Further advice should be sought from the Marketing Department.

12.6 The credit value of core, compulsory, elective or optional modules shall be a multiple of 15

---

18 For example, work placement, experiential learning, live projects, volunteering
19 Final definitions still to be approved
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Credits for both undergraduate and postgraduate. The minimum credit value for a module forming part of a programme of study as a core, compulsory, elective or optional module shall be 15 credits. Credit values of 60 and 120 (MRes only) are also available for postgraduate programmes for dissertations/projects.

12.7 5 and 10 credit modules can be developed for CPD/Executive Education purposes and a combination of modules can lead to a Postgraduate Certificate award. Proposals for the programme should ensure that consideration is made of assessment load to ensure there is no overburdening of students. For a Postgraduate Diploma a combination of 5 or 10-credit modules can be used but there must be in addition a 30-credit research module. For a full Masters programme a 60-credit dissertation (following the College’s Dissertation Framework) must also be included with the 30-credit research methods module.

12.8 Approval to use any other size unit of credit should be sought from the College Education Committee.

Assessment

12.9 Consideration should be made of the credit value of the module when designing the assessment methods to ensure there is no heavy assessment loading. Programme teams should consider whether the proposed volume of assessment is suitable to the credit attached to the individual module.

Contact hours

12.10 The programme team will need to consider the contact hours related to each module and the time dedicated to assessments. Normally, 1 credit = 10 hours of notional learning, therefore a 15-credit module should have 150 hours of overall student workload including assessments and private study.

12.11 A breakdown of the contact hours detailing the amount of hours assigned to lecturers, tutorials, seminars, virtual learning and private study for each module will need to be calculated. This information will then be recorded on the module descriptor.

Embedding Employability

12.12 Module designers must ensure that they follow the guidance in the Embedding Employability Toolkit when designing a new module be this part of a new programme that is being developed, a free standing module or a module that is being developed outside of the programme approval process.

12.13 Module designers should also speak to the Careers consultant responsible for the department to discuss the proposed embedded employability.

Module proposals

12.14 Documentation for new module proposals should consist of the following:

- an online module approval form (see Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms in the Quality Assurance Handbook).

The approval process

12.15 The module approval form must be submitted for approval to the appropriate FEC. FECs are free to request any information additional to this to fit their own particular requirements.

12.16 It is the responsibility of the FEC to ensure that the following have been taken into account before a module is approved:
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- all resource implications;
- that module designers have liaised appropriately with Library Services and other relevant academic support services;
- that module designers have used the Employability Toolkit to inform their approach to writing employability-led learning outcomes and embedding employability in the module;
- confirmation, if relevant, that the appropriate ethical approval has been sought and granted for modules (see Guidance on risk and ethics assessment in the design of modules on for further guidance);
- that equality of access and opportunity have been fully considered in the design of the module;
- for modules delivered by a collaborative Partner, consideration should be given to the suitability of the learning environment and available resources for delivering the module.

12.17 Where an FEC identifies that not all of the above have been taken into account, the Chair of the FEC should endeavour to resolve this in discussion with the Programme Leader. In cases where the FEC has been unable to ensure that all issues have been addressed, the advice of the Executive Dean of Faculty should be sought.

12.18 In approving modules Faculties should ensure that their procedures give due consideration to the academic standards and the quality of the learning opportunities available and, where external bodies are involved in the delivery of the teaching, that there are appropriate mechanisms in place to guarantee such standards and quality. FECs should ensure that where modules are approved but with conditions attached, that the fulfilment of those conditions is signed off on the programme approval documentation, reported back to the FEC and documented in FEC minutes.

12.19 Programmes of study are normally approved for a period of six years unless specified otherwise by the FEC. Re-approval is gained through the process of periodic programme review.

13. Modifications to programmes and modules

Modifications to programmes and modules

13.1 Depending on the nature of the programme or module modification depends on whether consideration needs to be made via PDASC or approval can remain at Faculty level. To aid faculties with an understanding of what constitutes a major or minor modification, along with implications for Competition and Market Authority (CMA) compliance, a table outlining individual modifications at programme and module level has been produced (see https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/about/governance/Prog-Approval-Resources/Programme-Module-Approval-Resources).

13.2 Included in the modification table is identification of when a student (offer, accepted or current) should be contacted and who in the College to speak to. Template letters are available to aid with the communications to students.

13.3 For both programmes and modules, there exist, inevitably, some grey areas between categories of modification which depend upon interpretation as to what might be deemed significant or substantial and what might be deemed less so. In such circumstances the programme team should consult, at the earliest opportunity, with the Vice Dean (Education) and Academic, Regulation and Compliance Office to determine the most appropriate category. In the event of any dispute about the appropriate categorisation, the Vice-Principal (Education) shall adjudicate.
Programme suspension/withdrawal

13.4 Any suspension or withdrawal of a programme must be undertaken in such a manner that the interests of current students, and students who have applied to the programme, are fully protected. Advice should be sought from Quality, Standards and Enhancement as early as possible to ensure that the appropriate procedures are followed. Further information can be found in the Policy for closing or suspending a programme.

13.5 Programmes that will not be offered to students from a known date should be formally withdrawn using the online system (OPAMA). A supporting statement noting that students remaining on the programme will be fully supported for the remainder of their studies should be noted.

13.6 FEC’s should approve the proposal to withdraw the programme before being forwarded to PDASC for final approval (who are approving on behalf of College Education Committee and Academic Board).

13.7 In exceptional circumstances where a programme is being withdrawn due to a member of staff no longer being available (e.g. through illness or resignation) and suitable alternative teaching or supervision arrangements cannot be provided then students must be contacted as soon as possible. Faculties should contact the admissions department to arrange for correspondence to be sent to students as soon as they are aware of the issue. Other options must be explored with the affected students e.g. considering whether the student can complete their programme at another institution or whether a student can be offered a place on an alternative programme at King’s.

13.8 Where a programme is delivered in collaboration with an external partner, the relevant Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) and related documents should be consulted as to timescales and processes for terminating the agreement.

14. Timescale for approval

Marketing timescales for 2021/22 start

14.1 Where possible the Marketing Department ask the following timescales for approval of new and major modification to programmes are adhered to as:

- UG programmes: 1st January 2020 (ideally) to 1st June 2020 (latest) for 2021/22 start
- PGT programmes: 1st June 2020 (ideally) to 1st October 2020 (latest) for 2021/22 start

CMA Compliance for 2020/21

14.2 Any changes which impact on the information provided in the Programme Information Sheets published during 2019/20 can no longer be accepted. In exceptional circumstances e.g. in response to External Examiner comments changes may be made but all affected students must be contacted and consulted regarding the proposed change. See the modifications table for further guidance.

14.3 When introducing a new optional module to the programme, this must be finalised 9 months prior to commencement, to enable timetabling process to be completed.

14.4 These are recommended timescales to allow for the inclusion of information for UCAS and the College’s prospectuses. In exceptional circumstances Faculties can introduce a new programme or module with a shorter lead-time to take account, for example, of the appointment of a new member of staff; however, in such cases, the Faculty should recognise that additional steps may need to be taken to market the programme and that adequate sized teaching rooms cannot be guaranteed as approval of the new module has fallen outside of normal timetabling procedures.
14.5 Modifications need to have been approved in time to allow them to be reflected in the documentation given to students at the beginning of each year. Modifications that result in differing information to that which has been publicised must be communicated to those students registering admission/interest to the programme advising them of the change.

14.6 Programmes cannot be advertised as being available in UCAS and College documents or on-line until they have been approved.

15. **Publication of programme specifications**

15.1 As discussed in paragraph 3.5 of Section A Introduction, the regulatory status of programme specifications and therefore their importance as providers of accurate information to staff and students requires their publication on only one occasion a year and via one central source; QSE is authorised by the Academic Board as this central source. Before publication each year Faculties will be required to confirm the accuracy of their programme specifications for the following year.
Section C
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Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision
1. Introduction

1.1 The procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision are designed to ensure that the College can implement its strategies through a set of key policy principles while remaining compliant with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.

1.2 The purpose of the key policy principles set out in paragraph 4 below is to promote good practice and to provide a framework for the effective management of King’s collaborative provision activity in a manner that advances the College’s academic reputation and manages quality assurance, financial and other risks associated with the Partner and the activity. It is premised on a risk-based approach and on the adoption of procedures for facilitating the development, approval and oversight of partnerships in delivering learning opportunities with others that are proportionate to the scale and complexity of the particular activity.

1.3 All such activity shall be carried out in accordance with King’s approved regulations, policies and procedures.

2. Scope

2.1 The procedures draw on and are consistent with the various components of the QAA’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education, in particular, the Expectations for Standards and for Quality, the Core Practices for Standards and for Quality and also the Advice and Guidance: Partnerships

2.2 In line with the UK Quality Code, these procedures and set of key policy principles apply to the framework for the management of all collaborative provision delivered, assessed or supported through an arrangement with a Partner that leads to or contributes to the award of King’s academic credit or a King’s qualification, and covers all partnership activity falling within the definitions detailed in paragraph 3 below.

3. Definitions

3.1 In this context the term ‘collaborative provision’ will be taken to mean any type of educational opportunity where the achievement of the relevant learning outcomes for a King’s module or programme of study is dependent on the arrangement made with a Partner.

3.2 In this context the term ‘programme of study’ is taken to apply equally to undergraduate, taught postgraduate and research postgraduate degrees.

3.3 Advice and Guidance: Partnerships covers a wide range of collaborative provision activity and the following (which is neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive) illustrates the types of arrangements that are currently offered by College and fall within the definition of collaborative provision covered by this policy. More information on the categories and characteristics of the different types of activity are given in Definitions of collaborative activity.

   a) Articulation, a partnership arrangement whereby cohorts of students who satisfy academic criteria on a programme offered by a Partner are automatically entitled to be considered for admission with advanced standing with Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) or Experiential Learning (EL) to a subsequent stage of the specified programme.
b) **Co-operative partnership**, an arrangement whereby the College enters into a partnership with another degree awarding body to design and jointly deliver a programme of study, but with only one awarding institution.

c) **Doctoral Training Centres/Partnerships**, a partnership arrangement whereby two or more awarding bodies collaborate in the delivery of Studentships, and personal, professional and career development skills training for research candidates. Included within this definition are **Doctoral Training Programmes** where there is a collaborative element to provision e.g. LAHP Doctoral Training Partnership.

d) **Double or Multiple Award**, a partnership arrangement whereby the College and one or more partner(s) provide a single jointly delivered programme for the same qualification but leading to separate awards and separate certification being granted by both King’s and the Partner(s).

 e) **Dual Award**, a partnership arrangement whereby the College and another Partner work together to offer a jointly conceived programme leading to separate awards (and separate certification) being granted by both King’s and the Partner.

 f) **Flying Faculty**, an arrangement whereby a programme is delivered in a location away from the main campus (usually in another country) by staff from the College who also carry out all assessment. Support for students may be provided by local staff, but the programme is solely delivered by King’s leading to a King’s only award.

 g) **Joint Award**, a partnership arrangement under which the College and one or more partner(s) provide a programme leading to a single award made jointly by King’s and the Partner(s). A single certificate or document (signed by the competent authorities) attests to the successful completion of this jointly delivered programme, replacing the separate institutional or national qualifications.

 h) **Off-campus study**, a partnership arrangement whereby an external provider designs learning opportunities or provides specialist teaching and/or resources, which have demonstrated adherence to the appropriate quality requirements and academic standards leading to a King’s award and where the learning opportunity is delivered on the partner’s premises.

 i) **Placement provision**, a partnership arrangement whereby an external provider delivers a planned period of experience in a work-based environment, that enables students to develop particular skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to achieving the relevant learning outcomes of a programme of study leading to a King’s award.

 j) **Progression**, a partnership arrangement whereby selected students, who have met the entry criteria, may be granted entry from a programme of study offered by another institution/body and admitted to a specified programme of study at the College without advanced standing.

 k) **Split-site PhD**, an arrangement whereby the College enters into a partnership with another institution for a ‘non-resident student’ to register for a King’s awarded PhD programme and receive joint supervision and access to shared resources.

 l) **Student Exchange**, a partnership arrangement whereby students are offered the opportunity to experience study overseas and enhance their degree. The strength of the partnership is expected to be both sustainable and reciprocal in nature.

 m) **Validated provision**, a partnership arrangement whereby King’s judges that a programme of study developed and delivered by another organisation is of an appropriate quality and standard to lead to a King’s award and is subject to King’s quality assurance procedures.

 3.4 The procedures do not cover:
Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

a) Individual student placement or internship opportunities as these are covered separately under the ‘Guidance on student placements’.

b) Individual research student opportunities as these are covered separately under the ‘Guidance on off-campus study in research degrees’.

c) Intercollegiate module opportunities as these are covered separately under the College’s Intercollegiate Policy, except for arrangements leading to a joint award and a single certificate issued by both parties.

d) Short courses as these are covered separately under the College’s Short Courses Policy.

e) Student Mobility or Summer School arrangements that do not lead to or contribute to King’s academic credit or a King’s qualification or where the provision of teaching and learning support is delivered by an external provider on King’s premises.

4. Key Policy Principles

4.1 The following key policy principles will underpin all partnership activity which should:

➢ enhance the reputation of the College as well as the Faculty\(^1\) sponsoring the partnership;
➢ be consistent with the College’s strategic plans and international strategy, reflecting the ethos and values of the College’s mission, and bring clear benefits to those involved;
➢ be equivalent to the awards delivered by the College, including compatibility with any relevant UK benchmarking information;
➢ be supported through the College’s governance arrangements for academic standards;
➢ be regulated by the College’s approved legal framework;
➢ be subject to appropriate due diligence processes to identify and assess risks prior to commencement and how these are to be mitigated and managed;
➢ be financially sustainable and appropriately resourced;
➢ be supported through quality assurance mechanisms to manage the delivery of the programme following the student lifecycle;
➢ be compliant with the College’s policy and procedures to meet the requirements of the Academic regulations.

5. Strategic considerations

5.1 King’s College London is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge, learning and understanding in the service of society.

5.2 The College’s Strategic vision 2029 commits King’s to securing its role as one of the world’s finest universities, acting in the service of society. King’s vision to make the world a better place is based on five strategic priorities supported through a set of transformative initiatives. (1) Educate to inspire and improve; (2) Research to inform and innovate; (3) Serve to shape and transform; (4) A civic university at the heart of London and (5) An international community that serves the world. Many partnerships that are appropriate at a departmental or divisional level are not best suited to other departments or divisions but these relationships should not be discouraged if they enhance research, knowledge exchange, learning, and student experience capacities.

5.3 The College’s International Strategy to 2020 is based on five strategic priorities (i) Attract the best international minds to King’s; (ii) Provide an internationalised curriculum and student experience; (iii) Invest in strategic partnerships with world-class institutions; (iv) Raise King’s profile as a thought-leader in areas of global significance; and (v) Create an

\(^1\) For the purposes of this document the term ‘Faculty’ is used as defined in College Ordinance B3
Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

ethical and exciting environment for King’s international activities. It aims to give students an international experience and to support mobility among staff and students.

6. Academic standards and awards

6.1 The Academic Board has responsibility for assuring the academic standards of awards that are developed and delivered through partnership arrangements, as well as students’ educational experiences, ensuring that these arrangements will be equivalent to those delivered solely by the College and also compatible with any relevant UK benchmarking information. This is undertaken through a quality assurance process of programme and module design, approval, modification, monitoring and review. All collaborative provision is therefore subject to the same quality assurance processes whether at College, Faculty or Department level.

7. Governance

7.1 The governance arrangements for partnerships operate under delegated authority from Academic Board. Those committees who have delegated responsibilities report into Academic Board the activity recently completed, and where applicable forward items for approval to Academic Board.

7.2 The College Education Committee (CEC) is a sub-committee of Academic Board and has specific responsibility for ensuring that the College’s academic provision is of the highest quality and standard and will enhance the student learning experience. CEC, on behalf of Academic Board, agrees a potential UK partner with partnership activity relating to taught programmes conforming to the College’s financial, regulatory and quality framework. Monitoring of all collaborative activity relating to taught programmes is overseen by the College Education Committee.

7.3 The Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee (PDASC) reports into CEC and brings together representatives from all Faculties (Institutes/Schools) to recommend initial approval of new programmes to CEC, including those delivered through a collaborative provision arrangement.

7.4 The Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee (CPSC) reports into CEC and has specific responsibility for advising CEC on the conduct of the College’s collaborative arrangements with a Partner Institution and for the strategic development of policies relating to collaborative provision. CPSC will consider proposals for new and complex types of activity, any arrangements escalated via the ERRR process or arrangements involving a non-UK Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) attached to the programme of study CPSC will monitor arrangements, including published information, advising CEC on any actions or issues in relation to standards or quality in the operation of collaborative partnerships.

7.3 The College International Committee (CIC) provides the necessary academic governance and oversight of all King’s international affairs by monitoring and approving Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), international partnership agreements and student exchange agreements.

7.4 The oversight of any learning opportunities embedded in a partnership arrangement resides with the Faculty through the relevant Education Committee or Postgraduate Research

---

2 International partners are approved by the College International Committee, see para 7.3
3 Collaborative activity relating to postgraduate research degrees is overseen by the Postgraduate Research Students Sub-Committee, reporting to College Research Committee as set out in the College’s “Procedures for postgraduate research degrees approval and monitoring”.
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Students Sub-committee (PRSS) with the day to day management of arrangements being undertaken at the local departmental level. Detailed scrutiny of the activity is undertaken by the Faculty with proposals for new or complex activity being forwarded to the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee for additional scrutiny.

7.5 Proposals to explore collaborative provision with a Partner for a King’s programme of study will be initially considered by the Faculty through the relevant Education Committee or Research Committee prior to submitting the proposal to PDASC or PRSS for approval (as detailed in sections 12.1 to 12.3 below).

7.6 Following initial approval, Faculties are responsible for undertaking detailed scrutiny of the collaborative proposal (as detailed in sections 12.4 to 12.5 below).

7.7 For taught programmes, final approval of any agreement for collaborative provision that leads to or contributes towards a King’s award or approval of a UK Partner is delegated to CEC, reporting to Academic Board. For postgraduate research degrees final approval; is delegated to PRSS and reported to the College Research Committee. Final approval of an International Partner is delegated to CIC (as detailed in section 12.6 below).

7.8 Responsibility for management of collaborative provision will rest with the relevant Executive Dean of Faculty for Faculty initiated partnerships and with a nominated ‘(Senior) Vice-President’ for College-initiated partnerships. Faculties are responsible for overseeing the management of collaborative arrangements, including monitoring and review processes, up until the renewal of any agreement. Proposals to renew or terminate an International Partner are determined by CIC. Recommendations to renew or terminate a UK Partner will be considered by CPSC reporting to CEC for final approval. Postgraduate Research degrees will be reported to PRSS for approval. Proposals to modify or terminate a Programme with collaborative activity following a review of activity will be the responsibility of CEC or PRSS (as detailed in sections 12.7 to 12.9 below).

7.9 Routine reports on current collaborative partners and activity are reported to CPSC on an annual basis.

8 Risk assessment and due diligence

8.1 All collaborative provision activity must undergo a two-stage risk assessment and due diligence process relating to (1) the Partner and (2) the type of activity proposed. This is to identify the likelihood and impact of any risks to the delivery of the programme or the Partner’s capacity to fulfil its designated role and be able to mitigate for these. This process is undertaken through the completion of an Ethical and Reputational Risk Review (ERRR) questionnaire and a Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool (CARAT).

8.2 The EERR process has an initial screening stage, whereby any risks to entering into an agreement with the Partner are flagged and a full screening process or further due diligence process conducted (where required). At this stage proposals are escalated to the Enterprise Risk Management Committee (ERMC) and may be referred to the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee (CPSC) for review, if deemed necessary to determine if the partnership should proceed and an MoU put in place. CPSC will report its findings relating to proposals for collaborative activity as part of a degree programme awarded by King’s directly to the College Education Committee (CEC).

8.3 The CARAT process determines if the overall risk for the Partner and activity should be categorised as high, medium or low. Where the risk falls in the top quartile of the high risk category this will be classed as significant to the impact and likelihood of King’s business
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continuity and risk appetite will be determined before the proposal can continue. Risks to consider include:

- **Partner-specific** e.g. ethical and reputational risks that could impact on the College, geographical location and cultural considerations;
- **Academic risks** e.g. dilution of the academic standards of awards and the quality of the student experience;
- **Legal risks** e.g. ability of the partner to legally contract with the College, compatibility with UK laws;
- **Financial risks** e.g. financial stability and transparency of the partner;
- **Resource risks** e.g. wasted effort and overstretching of School/department efforts; diversion of staff time away from core activities; preliminary travel and other costs which cannot be recouped immediately.

8.4 Following the ERRR and CARAT processes, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) may be put in place with the Partner noting areas for potential collaborative activity, if required. The approval of the MoU follows the outcome of the ERRR process resting with the College International Committee (CIC) for International Partners and CEC for UK Partners. It is expected that initiatives relating to specific departments or faculties will be brought to the attention of the relevant territorial Provost/Senior Vice President prior to completing the ERRR questionnaire.

9. Legal framework

9.1 All collaborative provision, whereby outside bodies deliver parts of a King’s programme, should be underpinned by a **Memorandum of Understanding** (where appropriate) and a **Memorandum of Agreement** and accompanying **Activity Schedule**, that are time limited.

9.2 Legal considerations, particularly those around international contract agreements, are very complex. For this reason the College has produced guidance and approved templates (MoU and MoA and accompanying Activity Schedule) for staff use and these are available from the College’s Legal Services page. Reference should be made to the College’s Definitions of collaborative activity for the type of activity engaged in as bespoke templates may be available to reflect the different types of activity, thus ensuring that the quality assurance procedures and processes are proportionate to the activity being undertaken with the inclusion and level of detail required determined by the nature of the activity and its associated risks. Where the agreement is produced in more than one language, a clear statement should be included to indicate which version is the ruling agreement and which the translation.

9.2 The MoU is a standard College document and describes the bilateral or multilateral agreement between two or more parties in its simplest form by setting out common aspirations and goals. The MoU will not imply a legal commitment but merely a statement of intention. The MoU will be signed off by either the Vice President/Vice-Principal (International) or nominee for international partners and by the Vice President/Vice Principal (Education) or Vice President/Vice Principal (Research) or nominee for UK Partners.

9.3 The MoA is also a standard College document and is used to set out the respective roles, responsibilities and obligations of the principal parties concerned and is time-limited to five calendar years. This is to ensure that the College and Partner are able to operate within any relevant legal or regulatory framework for delivering the programme and that appropriate governance arrangements are in place to authorize and oversee the development and closure of the partnership arrangement and monitor their effective operation. The MoA is a formal and legally-binding written document that forms the overarching agreement between the Parties to co-operate in delivering the programme arrangements.
Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

9.4 The MoA will be signed off by either the Vice President/Vice-Principal (International) or nominee for international partners and by the Vice President/Vice Principal (Education) or Vice President/Vice Principal (Research) or nominee for UK Partners. The MoA will be signed off by the President & Principal or nominee where the arrangement is in the top quartile of high risk to the College. The approval, monitoring and oversight of the MoA rests with CIC for International Partners and with CPSC reporting to CEC for UK Partners.

9.5 The Activity Schedule is used to set out the details of the operational arrangements and any special conditions for the delivery of the programme activity, including student protection clauses should the partnership terminate earlier than expected. The Activity Schedule should be time-limited to a maximum of five academic years or the duration of the first cohort of students completing the programme, but should ensure it does not exceed the expiration of the MoA itself. For medium or high risk programme activity it may be appropriate to time-limit the schedule to less than five years depending on the risks that have been identified at the outset.

9.6 There will be different Schedules to reflect different types of activity offered by the College as set out in the College’s ‘Definitions of collaborative activity’ outlined in the Quality Assurance Handbook, so that quality assurance procedures and processes are proportionate to the nature of the activity being undertaken. This is to enable the activity to be agreed with the partner and delivered effectively.

9.7 All Schedules will set out the respective responsibilities of the partners in the delivery of the shared activity throughout the student lifecycle and will document the learning opportunities and support that students will receive whilst studying at the home and host institutions. All Schedules will document the academic regulations, policies and procedures that apply and how academic standards and the quality of the provision will be maintained, monitored and reviewed.

9.8 Each Schedule will normally be attached to an MoA and will operate within the same timeframe when admitting cohorts of students to the programme. Schedules are approved by the relevant Faculty Education or Research Committee which maintains oversight of the programme arrangements, except for Schedules relating to jointly delivered programme activity leading to a Joint Award or linked awards where approval rests with PDASC or PRSS. The Faculty or PDASC or PRSS may escalate review of the Schedules to the CPSC prior to final approval by the relevant Committee.

9.9 There are nine different College Schedules are proposed as follows:

**Schedule 1: Operational arrangements for Articulation or Progression arrangements**

Schedule 1 will be required for a partnership arrangement that pairs a King’s degree programme with that of a degree programme offered by a Partner. Where cohorts of students are automatically entitled to be considered for admission with advanced standing (with or without RPL) to a subsequent of the specified programme having met the entry criteria agreed between the Partner and King’s this will be considered as an “Articulation” arrangement. Where selected students are considered for admission on a case by case basis without advanced standing to a specified programme having met the entry criteria agreed between the Partner and King’s this will be considered as a “Progression” arrangement. The approval, monitoring, management and oversight of these types of arrangement rests with the relevant Faculty Education Committee and is subject to the Admissions Regulations and policy for recognition of prior learning. It is not expected that these types of arrangement will be included in the normal College monitoring processes as there are unlikely to be any quality assurance conditions attached. However, they will be subject to a review of activity reporting into CPSC.
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Schedule 2: Operational arrangements for Jointly delivered Taught programmes
Schedule 2 will be required for a partnership that offers a jointly delivered or jointly conceived programme of study such as a co-operative partnership arrangement leading to an award and certificate from the home institution only; a Dual or Double/Multiple Award that leads to separate awards and certificates from each of the awarding institutions; or a Joint Award that leads to one award jointly conferred and where the single certificate replaces national or institutional qualifications. Approval of the programme will operate in the same way as internal provision with formal approval through the College’s programme approval process reporting into PDASC. If required, the final PAF will be subject to final consideration and approval from PDASC following a review of the operational arrangements by CPSC. The monitoring of the programme will be subject to the College’s usual procedures for annual monitoring (Programme Enhancement Plan) with a review of activity undertaken prior to the expiry of the MoA. Additionally, there should be a Joint Management Board or Committee established between the College and the Partner(s) to manage and oversee the arrangements and report into the relevant governance structure.

Schedule 3: Operational arrangements for Joint PhD programmes
Schedule 3 will be required for a partnership that leads to the award of a PhD delivered jointly by King’s and another institute of Higher Education that normally leads to a Joint Award. Where several Faculties of the College offer a PhD with the same institution these will be listed in one overarching Schedule. Approval of the Joint PhD programme will be the responsibility of Postgraduate Research Sub-committee (PRSS). Monitoring, management and oversight of the Programme will be through a Joint Academic Committee (JAC).

Schedule 4: Operational arrangements for ‘Split-Site’ PhD programmes
Schedule 4 will be required for a partnership that leads to the award of a PhD by King’s where another institute of Higher Education, or reputable research institute (without degree awarding powers), is the main locus of the student’s learning, and where a student will spend a period of more than 6 months at the Partner institution, with defined periods and supervision arrangements agreed at the outset. Such arrangements should be referred to as Split-Site PhD programmes. Approval of the PhD programme will be the responsibility of PRSS. Monitoring, management and oversight rests with the relevant Faculty reporting into PRSS.

Schedule 5: Operational arrangements for Off-campus taught programme study arrangements
Schedule 5 will be required for a partnership that provides specialist teaching or resources that are delivered to students away from the King’s campus to enable them to complete their King’s degree programme. Approval of the off-campus study arrangement will rest with the relevant Faculty Education Committee and be reported to PDASC as part of the programme approval process. Monitoring, management and oversight rests with the relevant Faculty and should be reflected in the PEP process. The review of activity prior to the renewal of the agreement rests with the relevant Faculty and should be reported to the CPSC.

Schedule 6: Operational arrangements for PhD programmes with periods spent off-campus
Schedule 6 will be required where students on a King’s PhD programme undertake a period of time away (which is not under a Split-Site PhD programme arrangement – see Schedule 4) from the university, and this study contributes towards their research. These arrangements usually relate to specialist resources and will have been assessed as part of the viability of the PhD project and agreed between the student and supervisor either in advance, or during the first year of the project. During periods away from the university, the student will continue to be supervised and undergo the formal progress monitoring process. Since these arrangements are unique to individual students/PhD projects a Schedule would not be required unless this
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activity falls under a College wide overarching MoA and is offered on a regular basis to more than one student. Where a Schedule is required this is subject to the approval and oversight of PRSS with the monitoring and management of the arrangement resting with the relevant Faculty reporting into PRSS.

Schedule 7: Operational arrangements for placement provision i.e. work-based learning (such as Medical Electives or internships)

Schedule 7 will be required for a partnership that includes a planned period of experience in a work-based learning environment that is assessed as part of the student’s final award. Where the arrangement is for an individual student as part of an internship programme this will be overseen by King’s Careers and Employability and the College’s Internship Host Agreement template should be used instead. Approval of work-based learning is the responsibility of the Faculty Education Committee. Where a Programme of Study includes a placement opportunity this should be reflected in the PAF and approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee reporting into PDASC as part of the programme approval process. Monitoring, management and oversight of the activity rests with the relevant Faculty and where this is attached to a programme of study should be reflected in the PEP process. Where the agreement is for the exchange of students with an international partner, responsibility for monitoring and oversight rests with CIC. The review of activity prior to the renewal of the agreement rests with the relevant Faculty and should be reported to CPSC.

Schedule 8: Operational arrangements for Student Exchanges

Schedule 8 will be required for a College-wide partnership with multiple activity that includes student exchanges operated through the Global Mobility Office contributing to the student’s final award, enabling them to experience study overseas and enhance their degree. Where several Faculties of the College offer a student exchange with the same institution only one overarching Schedule will be necessary (listing all contributors). Where the arrangement is department or Faculty specific and there is unlikely to be a MoA in place or further activity with the Partner, the College’s Student Exchange Agreement (SEA) template should be used instead. Erasmus inter-institutional arrangements are subject to a separate template agreement. Advice for all student exchange arrangements should be sought from Global Mobility prior to completing the paperwork. Approval, for all student exchange agreements rests with CIC. Where a Programme of Study offers a student exchange this should be reflected in the Programme Approval Form (PAF) and approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee reporting into PDASC as part of the programme approval process. Monitoring and oversight rests with CIC and the management of the Partner relationship with Global Mobility. The monitoring, management and oversight of the academic provision rests with the relevant Faculty and should be reflected in the PEP process. The review of activity prior to the renewal of the agreement rests with the relevant Faculty and should be reported to CPSC and CIC.

Schedule 9: Operational arrangements for Short Courses

Schedule 9 will be required for a partnership that includes a Short Course that leads to an award of credit from the College and/or forms an integral part of the student’s degree programme following the approval process set out in the College’s Short Course Policy. For short courses residing in Faculties the approval process rests with the Faculty reporting into PDASC. For all other credit bearing short courses, the approval process will be the responsibility of PDASC. Monitoring, management and oversight of short course arrangements rests with the relevant Faculty Education Committee.

9.10 Activity schedules are not required for the following types of arrangement as these are considered as part of a commercial or research contract, although the operational
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arrangements governing the programme and the responsibilities of the parties involved should be embedded within the body of the agreement itself.

(a) Doctoral Training Centres/Partnerships, part of a research contract, normally determined by the relevant Research Council.

(b) Flying Faculty arrangements, part of a commercial agreement, normally drawn up by the King’s Professional and Executive Development (KPED) office.

(c) Validation arrangements, incorporates commercial arrangements into the agreement, normally drawn up by the King’s Professional and Executive Development (KPED) office.

10. Programme Management

10.1 For a partnership leading to an award or the award of credit, the College’s management of the programme or module shall operate in the same way as internal provision with formal approval and review through the College’s programme and module approval and review processes (see Sections B, D and E). Where the activity leads to an award of the College this will be supplemented by central support for the agreement of a partner, the approval of the academic provision and the management of records including the register of collaborative provision.

10.2 The following areas (where appropriate for the activity) should be agreed during the establishment and before the commencement of the activity for the management of the programme and specified in the Activity Schedule:

- Relevant timescales for the programme activity;
- Financial arrangements;
- Administrative contacts;
- Marketing and publicity;
- Recruitment and admissions;
- Enrolment and registration;
- Student records;
- Student support;
- Teaching or supervision arrangements;
- Assessment arrangements;
- External Examiner arrangements;
- Conferment of Award;
- Certificates and Graduation;
- Student Conduct and Appeals arrangements;
- Quality Assurance and Management processes;
- Monitoring arrangements;
- Alumni programme.

10.3 All programme activity must meet the requirements of the College’s Academic regulations, and relevant programme specifications. Approval for any suspension of regulations must be sought prior to programme approval or modification. Where a modification is made to a programme of study relating to the partnership arrangement this will constitute a major modification.

11 Process for the approval, monitoring and review of collaborative provision

11.1 The processes for approval, monitoring and review of collaborative provision are set out in section 12 below.
11.2 The proposer should consult the relevant strategy, policy and regulatory documents on the Governance Zone and the register of collaborative activity for guidance before submitting a proposal for collaborative provision. Quality Standards and Enhancement (QSE) and appropriate professional services departments should be consulted directly for advice and support when developing proposals for the following activities:

- All activity – QSE
- Articulation/Progression - the Admissions Section of Students and Education, and the Marketing and Widening Participation teams of the External Relations Directorate.
- Cultural partners – King’s Cultural Institute
- International partners – Global Engagement
- Research Degree proposals – the Centre for Doctoral Studies

11.3 There is a modified approval process for Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships (DTC/DTP) and Placements (including internships). Please refer to the relevant separate guidance documents for the approval process to follow. For international student exchange agreements, please consult with QSE and the Global Mobility Office over the approval process to follow as this will depend on the partner and the nature of the student exchange arrangement being proposed.

11.4 Consideration of all ‘other’ activity not covered by these procedures rests with the relevant Faculty, with approval needed from the College International Committee where the activity is undertaken with an international partner. Sign off for agreements rests with the relevant Senior Officer (Principal’s Executive Team).
12. Process Maps

Stage One (Approval in principle to explore partnership)

Detailed information on each of the stages outlined in these process maps is given in paragraphs 12.1 to 12.9 below.

Is the proposal with an existing partner?

Yes

Complete: the ERRR form
For international partners: contact the Global Engagement Office for advice on completing the form. This is subject to endorsement from the VP & VP (International)
For UK partners contact the Quality, Standards & Enhancement Administrator (Quality Assurance)
If appropriate, a MoU will be put in place following the ERRR review process

Is there existing paperwork (contact QSE for information) relating to the Partner relevant to the activity proposed?

No

Submit: PPF for Taught programmes to QSE for approval by PDASC. PPF for research degrees to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for approval by PRSS. Recommendations and endorsement from relevant parties must be obtained prior to submission.

Outcome: PDASC or PRSS will consider the proposal and either give
(a) approval to proceed to Stage Two;
(b) referral back to the proposer;
(c) referral to another appropriate committee or office;
(d) reject proposal.

Yes

Complete relevant proposal form for new programme
Submit: form to the relevant Faculty Education/Research Committee (or equivalent) for consideration.
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Stage Two (Detailed scrutiny of proposals for collaborative provision)

Is there an existing Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) and Activity Schedule with the Partner?

- **No**
  - **Discuss:** mapping programme activity with the partner
  - **Draft:** a MoA and accompanying Activity Schedule in liaison with the partner
  - **Forward:** draft MoA and/or Activity Schedule to QSE for review and to provide comments. The draft MoA and/or Activity schedule may be escalated to CPSC for expert opinion.

- **Yes**
  - **Discuss:** mapping programme activity with the partner
  - **Draft:** an Activity Schedule in liaison with the partner where the proposed activity is new or cannot be incorporated into an existing Activity Schedule

**Taught degree programmes**

- **Complete:** relevant programme/ module documentation (Taught programmes only) via OPAMA
- **Submit:** documentation and any supporting documentation required as an outcome of the risk assessment and due diligence process to the relevant Faculty Education committee for consideration and approval
- **Forward:** documentation to QSE for oversight and approval by the Chair of PDASC. For complex arrangements or as a condition of Stage One approval, the PAF and draft activity schedule may be forwarded to PDASC for final consideration and approval and to CPSC for detailed scrutiny of the activity schedule.

**Research Degree programmes**

- **Submit:** documentation and any supporting documentation required as an outcome of the risk assessment and due diligence process to the relevant Faculty Research committee for consideration and approval
- **Forward:** documentation, including any supporting documentation (e.g. confirmation of committee approval for variations in assessment) to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for oversight and approval by PRS

**Outcome:** PDAC or PRSS will consider the agreement for the proposed programme activity and either give
- (a) approval to proceed to Stage Three;
- (b) refer back to the proposer for clarification or reasons for decline;
- (c) refer to another appropriate committee or office for further consideration.
Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

**Stage Three** *(Final approval of proposals for collaborative provision)*

- **Final consideration and approval given by PDASC or PRSS**

- **Sign:** final draft MoA and accompanying Activity Schedule (appropriate authority depending on partner and risk category)

- **Submit:** final signed documentation to Head of Collaborative Provision in QSE

- **Register of collaborative partners updated to include new activity in annual reports to CPSC**

- **Approval process complete**
**Stage Four** *(Monitoring and Management of collaborative provision)*

### Annual Monitoring

**Consult:** the relevant procedures for programme monitoring and review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught degrees</th>
<th>Research degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide:</strong> information on collaborative programme activity in the Programme Enhancement Plan.</td>
<td><strong>Provide:</strong> a JAC report for Joint PhDs (for College-wide partners this will be produced centrally by the Centre for Doctoral Studies) or information on collaborative activity to your relevant Faculty Research Committee for inclusion in the Faculty annual report form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submit:</strong> to the relevant Faculty Education Committee for approval</td>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> a Faculty Annual Report will be completed following review of submitted documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> the FEC either approves the plan advising whether there is a need for a higher level meeting or rejects the plan and returns this to the department for further work</td>
<td><strong>Forward:</strong> Faculty or JAC reports to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for review and consideration by PRSS. For Doctoral Studies JAC reports will additionally be reported to CPSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward:</strong> plans to QSE and KA for review. An overview report will be produced and submitted to relevant College Committees, with information specific to the Partner and the collaborative arrangement being reported to CPSC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Review of Activity

**Consult:** the relevant procedures for programme monitoring and review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taught degrees</th>
<th>Research degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete:</strong> Review of Activity Form and either draft MoA/Activity Schedule or withdrawal letter</td>
<td><strong>Complete Review of Activity form and either draft MoA/Activity Schedule or withdrawal letter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submit:</strong> documentation to the relevant Faculty Education Committee for consideration. The final Review of Activity form and draft MoA/Activity Schedule or withdrawal letter should be submitted to the Head of Collaborative Provision for review by CPSC.</td>
<td><strong>Submit:</strong> documentation to the relevant Faculty Research Committee. The final Review of Activity form and draft MoA/Activity Schedule or withdrawal letter should be submitted <strong>to the Head of Collaborative Provision for review by CPSC.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> final documentation and summary of review by CPSC will be reported to CEC for formal approval.</td>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> final documentation and feedback from CPSC should be submitted to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for approval by PRSS reporting to CRC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Following approval by CEC or PRSS

**Sign:** final agreement documentation or withdrawal letter

**Submit:** final documentation to QSE

**Register of collaborative partners updated**

**Re-approval process complete**
12.1 Stage One (Approval in principle to explore partnership)

Initiation may come from the College or the proposed partner. Prior to committee consideration, informal discussions should be held with the Vice President/Vice-Principal (Education) for all collaborative programme activity involving award bearing education and the Vice President/Vice-Principal (International) for a proposed collaboration with an international partner. All proposals are subject to a risk assessed due diligence process to ensure it fits with the College strategic plan, is financially viable, and that resources committed to the development of a proposal has a reasonable likelihood of final approval via the process outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consult:</th>
<th>QSE for advice on existing documentation relating to the partner for the activity proposed, who will advise if there is any paperwork already in place that is relevant to the Partner and the type of activity being proposed and provide guidance on next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete:</td>
<td>(1) The questionnaire on 'Ethical and Reputational Risk Review' (ERRR form). For International Partners, you should also consult with the Global Engagement Office for advice on completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire is subject to review and endorsement from the Vice President/Vice-Principal (International) and may be referred to the Enterprise Risk Management Committee (ERMC) following completion of the initial screening section, if deemed appropriate. For UK Partners please contact the Quality, Standards &amp; Enhancement Administrator (Quality Assurance) for advice on completing the form. The form may be referred to the ERMC following completion of the initial screening section. (2) The Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool (CARAT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward:</td>
<td>ERRR and CARAT to the Head of Collaborative Provision in QSE to review risks associated with the Partner and Activity proposed. Documents may also be escalated to CPSC for expert opinion where the likelihood and associated risks identified may pose a risk to the College's Business Continuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome:</td>
<td>Following approval of the Partner, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) may be put in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taught degree programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete:</th>
<th>Programme Proposal form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submit:</td>
<td>Programme Proposal form together with the ERRR and CARAT to the relevant Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent) for consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

Approval:
- Executive Dean of Faculty
- Relevant Provost/Senior Vice President

Send:
PPF to QSE for consideration by the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee (PDASC).

Research degree programmes

Complete:
Initial Proposal for New Research Programme form
For Joint PhD proposals where arrangements are already in place with the Partner, a summary statement should be provided as part of the proposal form. This should include the strategic reason for extending the existing partnership arrangement to cover the proposed new programme; details on how the delivery of the programme and available resources fit into the existing agreement; and noting any additional risk factors not previously known, advising how these will be mitigated.

Submit:
Initial Proposal for New Research Programme form together with the ERRR and CARAT to the relevant Faculty Research Committee (or equivalent) for consideration.
Once approved in principal the form and outcome report should be forwarded to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for approval via the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee (PRSS).

Approval:
- Associate Dean of Doctoral Studies
- Executive Dean of Faculty
- Relevant Provost/Senior Vice President

All collaborative proposals

Risk category: The level of risk attached to the proposal will be categorised as ‘low’, ‘medium’ or ‘high’ as determined by the CARAT.

Outcome: PDASC or PRSS will consider the proposal and either:
(a) give approval to proceed to Stage Two;
(b) refer back to the proposer for clarification or reasons for decline;
(c) refer to another appropriate committee or office for consideration;
(d) reject proposal

Stage One Completion: Where Stage One is complete all proposals shall move to Stage Two

12.2 Due diligence supporting documentation: in order to gain an understanding of the risks associated with the proposal and enable an informed decision to be made on approval of provision, supporting documentation will be required from the partner as part of the due diligence process and may include the following:
- The mission statement and strategic plan of the partner organisation;
- Information about overseas institutions from UK and indigenous government offices and agencies;
- A plan or chart of the partner institution’s organisation structure;
- Confirmation of the legal status and ability to contract with King’s;
- Financial accounts of the partner organisation for the last 3 years;
- Evidence of the experience of the institution in delivering comparable courses at the same level;
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- Evidence of the reputation and/or academic standing of the partner based on recognised performance indicators such as league tables;
- Evidence of the institution’s understanding of the elements underpinning the King’s quality framework which would be applicable to the prospective partner such as the academic regulations; policies in areas such as degree classification, marking and moderation, research degree supervision; details of the partner’s external examiner system; staff student liaison committee minutes; annual and periodic review reports; details of access for students to academic / pastoral support and guidance;
- The partner’s institutional quality assurance strategy and or procedures;
- An outline of the structure for student support and pastoral guidance
- An outline of the structure for student feedback;
- The institutional policy and procedures for the appointment, appraisal and development of staff;
- Policies on legal compliance including equal opportunities, data protection or other areas;

12.3 Relevant documents

- Academic regulations
- College strategic vision
- College international strategy
- Definitions of collaborative activity
- Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes
- Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity
- Guidance on student placements
- Policy and procedures for validation and accreditation
- Register of collaborative activity
- Template for Ethical and Reputational Risk questionnaire
- Template for Memorandum of Understanding
- Template for Taught Programme Proposal form
- Template for Initial Proposal for new Research Programme form
- Template for Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool
- QAA Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: Partnerships and Advice and Guidance: Learning and Teaching

12.4 Stage Two (Detailed scrutiny of proposals for collaborative provision)

Detailed scrutiny of proposals for collaborative activity should be undertaken to complete the risk assessment and due diligence process. Depending on the partnership and nature of the activity, the level at which the scrutiny will take place is defined by the risks identified in Stage One. Consult with QSE and the Centre for Doctoral Studies to check what agreement documentation is already in place and for advice on completing or amending new/existing paperwork.

| Discuss | Mapping of programme activity with partner and identify respective roles, responsibilities and obligations of each partner in the organisational arrangements for the programme |
### Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft</th>
<th>A MoA and accompanying Activity Schedule, where these do not already exist, in liaison with the Partner for the proposed activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward</td>
<td>The draft MoA and Activity Schedule to QSE for review. The documents may be escalated to the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee to provide the relevant expertise and advice on areas that need to be addressed or considered further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit:</td>
<td>Documentation and any supporting documentation required as an outcome of the risk assessment process at Stage One to the relevant Faculty Education Committee (Taught programmes) or Faculty Research Committee (Research programmes) or equivalent for detailed scrutiny. The supporting documentation (see paragraph 12.2 above) submitted as part of the due diligence process may be used to aid the scrutiny of proposals and inform the recommendation for approval. For Taught degree programmes you will also need to complete the Programme approval and/or module approval or programme/module modification documentation (via OPAMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by:</td>
<td>Faculty Education/Research Committee or equivalent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Taught degree programmes

**Outcome:** QSE will review the final programme documentation and draft agreement documents and forward to the Chair of PDASC for initial approval (final approval resides with CEC). For complex arrangements or as a condition of Stage One approval the PAF and draft activity schedule may be forwarded to PDASC for final consideration and approval to proceed to Stage Three.

#### Research degree programmes

**Outcome:** PRSS will review the final programme documentation and draft agreement documentation for final approval

**Stage Two Approval:** Where Stage Two approval is given all proposals shall move to Stage Three

### 12.5 Relevant documents
- *Procedures for programme and module approval and modification and related forms*
- *Template for Memorandum of Agreement* incorporating Activity Schedule

### 12.6 Stage Three (Final approval of proposals for collaborative provision)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Approval:</th>
<th>Final approval and consideration by the PDASC or PRSS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign:</td>
<td>Where appropriate the Memorandum of Agreement must be signed by the partner organisation and the appropriate authority depending on the risk category before the final Activity Schedule is signed by the relevant Head of Department or nominee. The Activity Schedule is not valid without a legally-binding Memorandum of Agreement being in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Risk category:  | Depending on the risk identified by completing the ERRR and CARAT

**Low risk:** Executive Dean of Faculty for UK partners or Vice-President/Vice-Principal (International) for all international partners
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Approval Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium risk:</td>
<td>relevant Provost/ Senior Vice President for UK partners or Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (International) for all international partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk:</td>
<td>Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (Education) for UK partners or Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (International) for international partners or Principal &amp; President / nominee Provost/ Senior Vice President (top quartile of high risk).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit: | Final signed documentation to Head of Collaborative Provision in QSE

Stage Three Approval: | The approval process is complete when the final signed copy of the MoA and accompanying Activity Schedule is submitted to QSE and added to the College’s register of collaborative partners for routine reporting to Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee.

12.7 Stage Four (Monitoring and Management of collaborative provision)

Prior to the activity commencing, monitoring and management arrangements for continual review of the activity should be agreed between all partners, including putting in place a mechanism for the effective management and oversight of the administration necessary to monitor the shared activity. Depending on the level of risk, the minimum expectation is that all activities should be monitored on an annual basis with a fuller review of activity taking place in accordance with the notice period clause set out in the MoA and at least six months prior to the expiry of the agreement. Where the activity includes study away from King’s, a King’s representative is normally expected to visit the partner organisation, meet with staff and students and review the environment and resources available to students and reporting to the relevant Faculty committee through the Programme Enhancement Planning process for Taught programmes or annual monitoring process for Research programmes.

### Annual Monitoring of Taught degree programmes

| Consult: | All Taught programme activity including those with collaborative provision are subject to the ‘Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review’. |
| Provide: | Information on collaborative programme activity in the Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP). |
| Submit: | PEP to the relevant Faculty Education Committee for approval. |
| Outcome: | The relevant Faculty Education Committee reviews the PEP and either: (a) approves with no further action (b) approves, noting the need for a higher level meeting (c) returns back to the department for further work |
| Forward: | PEP submitted to QSE. An overview report will be produced and submitted to relevant College Committees with information specific to the Partner and collaborative arrangement being reported to CPSC. For validated provision, the minutes of the Annual Review Meeting will be submitted direct by QSE to CPSC. |

### Annual Monitoring of Research degree programmes
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consult:</th>
<th>All programme activity including those with collaborative provision are subject to the &quot;Procedures for postgraduate degrees approval and monitoring&quot;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide:</td>
<td>Information or a report from your Joint Academic Committee (JAC), a JAC report for College-wide partners will be produced centrally by the Centre for Doctoral Studies, including any relevant minutes of meetings held about the programme, to your Faculty Research Committee for consideration and inclusion in the Faculty annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome:</td>
<td>A Faculty Annual Report will be completed, including reference to any issues arising from jointly delivered PhD programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward:</td>
<td>Faculty or JAC Reports to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for review and consideration by PRSS. JAC reports will additionally be reported to CPSC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Activity

| Complete: | • Review of activity form;  
|           | • EITHER draft a new agreement (MoA and/or Activity Schedule) setting out the terms of reference and details for the shared activity between the partners to renew the arrangement OR draft a formal letter withdrawing from the agreement and setting out the mechanisms by which both parties agree for enabling current students to complete their programme under the terms of the expiring agreement;  
|           | For validation arrangements, this process should be completed as part of the periodic review process agreed between the parties and set out in the Memorandum of Agreement. |
| Submit:  | Final documentation to the relevant Faculty Education Committee or equivalent (Taught programmes) or Faculty Research Committee or equivalent (Research programmes) for consideration. |
| Forward: | The final Review of Activity form and draft agreement/activity schedule or withdrawal letter to CPSC for review and approval by CEC. CPSC will provide guidance, where requested, to the relevant College authority on the decision to continue or discontinue the activity  
|           | A new Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) may be put in place with the Partner following the review of activity process |

*Taught degree programmes*

| Outcome: | Following review by the relevant Faculty Education Committee or equivalent, the final documentation should be submitted to the Head of Collaborative Provision in the Quality, Standards & Enhancement Office for review by the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee. The findings will be reported to CEC for formal approval. |

*Research degree programmes*

| Outcome | Following consideration by the relevant Faculty Research Committee, final documentation should be submitted to the Centre for Doctoral Studies review by the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee. The findings will be reported to Postgraduate Research Student Sub Committee for approval reporting into College Research Committee. |
### Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision

| Final approval: | Final approval to renew or terminate the collaborative activity rests with CEC or PRSS. CIC will be responsible for renewing or terminating the relationship with an international partner. CEC will be responsible for renewing or terminating the relationship with a UK Partner.  

**Faculty-initiated partnerships:** recommendation for renewal or termination following consideration of the documentation by the relevant College Committee rests with the Executive Dean of Faculty (low risk activity) or the relevant Provost/ Senior Vice President (medium/high risk activity).  

Where a recommendation is made to terminate an agreement for ‘low risk’ activity this will also require endorsement from the relevant Provost/ Senior Vice President.  

**College-initiated partnerships:** a recommendation for renewal or termination following consideration of the documentation by the relevant College Committee rests with the Vice President/ Vice-Principal (Education) for UK partnerships or the Vice President/ Vice-Principal (International) for International partnerships or the President & Principal. |
| Sign: | Following final approval the new MoA and accompanying Schedule of Activity or formal letter terminating the activity must be signed by the partner organisation and the appropriate authority depending on the risk category.  

For all collaborative provision involving an international partner this will be undertaken by the Vice President/ Vice-Principal (International) and reported to the College International Committee. |
| Risk category: | **Low risk:** Executive Dean of Faculty for UK partners or Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (International) for all international partners  

**Medium risk:** relevant Provost/ Senior Vice President for UK partners or Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (International) for all international partners  

**High risk:** Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (Education) for UK partners or Vice-President/ Vice-Principal (International) for international partnerships or Principal & President / nominee Provost/ Senior Vice President (top quartile of high risk). |
| Submit: | Final signed MoA and/or Activity Schedule to the Head of Collaborative Provision in QSE. |
| Stage Four Approval: | The approval process is complete when final approval for the continuation or termination of the programme has been given, and a final signed copy of the MoA and/or Activity Schedule or formal termination letter has been submitted to QSE and the College’s Register of collaborative partners is updated. |

#### 12.8 Programme modification and agreement variation processes

Where the programme enhancement process triggers a modification to the programme delivery (including suspension/termination) or a variation/termination of the agreement this will be subject to the relevant College procedures for modifying a programme and the relevant terms and conditions set out in the agreement and/or Activity Schedule underpinning the programme arrangements.

#### 12.9 Additional monitoring for jointly delivered awarded programmes and validated provision:

- *Jointly delivered taught programmes:* a Joint Programme Management Committee should be established with terms of reference and membership from all parties involved
Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision in monitoring the delivery of the programme. The Committee should meet at least annually (virtual meetings are permitted) and will be responsible for overseeing the administrative and quality aspects of the programme including relationship management, changes to the programme structure, student admissions, progression and assessment matters, student engagement, external examiner reporting and any other issues identified for the effective management and oversight of the administration necessary to monitor the shared activity in liaison with the partner. Best practice/issues arising from joint meetings should be fed back through the appropriate mechanism of the College e.g. assessment matters referenced in the relevant assessment board minutes and the views of programme team clearly referenced in the PEP process and External Examiner reports.

- **Jointly delivered research programmes**: a Joint Academic Committee should be established to oversee the arrangement following the College’s ‘Core terms of reference for a Joint Academic Committee for joint PhD programmes’.

- **Validated provision**: an annual review meeting must take place with representatives from the partner, relevant Faculty Education Committee and QSE to oversee the administrative and quality aspects of the programme including relationship management and any other issues identified for the effective management and oversight of the administrative arrangements necessary to monitor the shared activity in liaison with the partner. The minutes of the meeting should be sent to the relevant Faculty Education Committee to consider any issues arising from the arrangement that requires attention and will be reported into CPSC. Modifications to the programme / module specifications will be considered by the relevant Faculty Assessment Board and submitted to Academic Standards Sub-Committee for consideration reporting into CEC for approval prior to final approval from Academic Board.

12.9 Relevant documents

- Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review
- Procedures for postgraduate research degrees approval and monitoring
- Template for review of activity

13. Renewal of partnership arrangements

13.1 The ERRR and CARAT should be reviewed prior to entering into a new MoU or MoA with the Partner. The Activity Schedules should only be renewed once the review of the activity has been undertaken and approved at the relevant Committee level.

13.2 Where a recommendation is made by the relevant Committee to terminate an agreement this will require the endorsement of the relevant Provost/Senior Vice President for Faculty led agreements and the relevant Vice-President/Vice Principal for College-wide agreements.

13.3 Decisions to renew or terminate an agreement or activity schedule will be reported into CIC for International Partners and CPSC for UK Partners.

14. Further information

14.1 Useful information and guidance on collaborative activity is published by the QAA, see for example:
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- *Review of Transnational Education (overseas provision)*  
  [https://www.qaa.ac.uk/international/transnational-education-review](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/international/transnational-education-review)
- *Supporting resources* [https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/supporting-resources](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/supporting-resources)

14.2 Universities UK publishes information on international developments to support universities international strategy [https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/international](https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/international)

14.3 ECCTIS manages a number of national agencies on behalf of the UK Government and the European Union and publishes a number of useful documents as follows:

- [http://www.ecctis.co.uk/europass/documents/ds_chart.pdf](http://www.ecctis.co.uk/europass/documents/ds_chart.pdf)
Section D
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1. **Introduction to monitoring and review**

1.1 Faculty Education Committees (FECs) (or equivalent bodies), as specified in the Faculty core governance functions (see https://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/governancelegal/faculty-governance), are responsible for ensuring that monitoring of all programmes within the Faculty are undertaken and for reporting such reviews to the College Education Committee (CEC).

1.2 While the College undertakes a process of curriculum refresh, periodic programme review will be suspended. Monitoring of programmes will be undertaken via the Programme Enhancement Process, which has been enhanced for the next couple of years while this curriculum refresh exercise is completed (see below).

2. **Aims, objectives and process for programme enhancement**

2.1 The purpose of annual monitoring is aimed at continuous improvement of the quality of the programme offered by King’s. The main function is to provide a regular check for programmes which is both helpful but realistic in its demands and which focuses on key quality and standards issues and enhancement.

2.2 The principles of the annual programme review process are based on the Quality Assurance Agency UK Quality Code for Higher Education, *Advice and Guidance: Monitoring and evaluation* that “Monitoring and evaluation of higher education is an essential process within providers, forming a fundamental part of the academic cycle. It can, and should, look at all aspects of the higher education experience. All higher education providers are involved in course monitoring and review processes as these enable providers to consider how learning opportunities for students may be improved.”

*Programme Enhancement Plans*

2.3 The *Programme Enhancement Process* aims to replace existing reporting processes (annual monitoring, education action planning, NSS action planning, PTES action planning and TEF data action planning) with a single streamlined process.

2.4 Strategy, Planning and Analytics (SPA) and Careers and Employability have produced UG and PGT dashboards on a number of benchmarked data by programme and by cohort (against Faculty, not to be confused with TEF benchmark) together with flags/RAG rating. The data will follow the student lifecycle and includes the core TEF metrics. The data dashboards will be updated to include live/most recent data as and when this becomes available. The data will include the last 3 years of data so that any trends can be identified.

2.5 All indicators will be weighted equally. Where a programme is 3% above or below the benchmark, this will generate one positive or negative flag. Where a programme is 5% above or below the benchmark, this will generate two positive or negative flags. Where a programme has three or more negative flags, it will receive a red RAG rating. Where a programme has two or more positive flags and no negative flags, this will be coded green. All other programmes will be classified as amber.

2.6 Some programmes will not have data for specific indicators as the data is too small. Where this is the case, departmental data will be available from the dashboard or linked dashboards. The Head of Department (or their academic nominee writing the report) can determine

---

1 Following an exercise of Portfolio Simplification, where marketing and commercial viability of programmes was completed, those programmes that remain will be required to go through a refresh of their curriculum, ensuring the new programme architecture and vision of the Education Strategy has been incorporated into each programme.

2 *Programme Enhancement Process*
whether it is appropriate to aggregate the response up to departmental level or whether the data is too insignificant to warrant a response.

Completion of the Programme Enhancement Plan

2.7 The Head of Department or academic nominee co-produce a concise Programme Enhancement Plan with students and which includes all programmes in the department. It is for the Head of Department or academic nominee to decide how to engage with students to produce the plan.

2.8 Where a programme is joint honours it is expected that the two departments involved will join together to write a response. A programme that has been developed with King’s Online must be included in Department report that the programme is taught within. King’s Online will not write a separate report.

2.9 The Programme Enhancement Plan is divided into two parts: Part A is the enhancement plan for the programmes in the department over the next 12 months structured according to the TEF framework specification headings of Teaching Quality, Learning Environment, and Student Outcomes and Learning Gain. The enhancement plan can be produced at any time that the Faculty considers appropriate – the Faculty Education Committee (FEC) will determine the deadline for this. The plan should be considered a live document, developed with students and in response to student feedback, staff and external examiner feedback, approved by the FEC and considered periodically during the academic year by the FEC or at another forum which has student representation.

2.10 Part B of the enhancement plan considers the data dashboard. As the data will be added to the dashboard as soon as it becomes available, this means that Faculties can have the option to complete Part B in stages as and when particular data is published. This part of the plan includes actions to address all areas which receive negative flags in the data and an update on the implementation of the previous year’s programme enhancement plan.

2.11 To ensure effective monitoring is conducted while periodic programme review is suspended, those programmes that have not held a programme review since 2015/16 are required to complete a couple of extra sections on the report, relating to themes raised in external examiner reports and trends found in the data. If, from this report, it is felt that the programme(s) could benefit from a discussion with senior management, the Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement will arrange a meeting.

2.12 This part of the plan also focuses on good practice and how this is being disseminated. Faculties are asked to provide details about what works well in the particular faculty/department/school and also to evidence how they know that the particular activity/initiative works well.

2.13 While the Head of Department or academic nominee must address all negative flags, they can decide whether or not to write about any positive flags. The focus on part two of the plan is on enhancement and impact rather than process and on identifying practices that should be highlighted for the benefit of the wider college.

2.14 Where a negative flag has been raised but the data is either too small or the area relating to the flag does not apply to the programme e.g. PGT flag on dissertations will not apply to PGCert and PgDip programmes, the author of the report can write n/a against the flag and the reason why.

2.15 Whereas the data scrutiny process is retrospective, objective, data driven and mirroring the student lifecycle, programme enhancement planning is predominantly forward looking and focussed on the continuous improvement of the student academic experience, including around employability in line with faculty strategic ambitions. It is recognised that the
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metrics are not the only means by which faculties monitor the quality of teaching on programmes. Peer review processes and discussion with students in Staff Student Liaison Committees (SSLCs) are also important dialogic forms of accountability which contribute to enhancing teaching.

Submission of the Programme Enhancement Plan to Faculty Education Committee

2.16 Part B of the form must be considered and approved by the relevant FEC prior to submission to Quality, Standards and Enhancement team. The FEC will agree where the detailed scrutiny of part two of the plan should take place but in all cases the full FEC should consider whether any issues raised by the data dashboard have been addressed sufficiently. Where the FEC considers that this is not the case, they will refer Part B back to the relevant Programme Leader for further work before resubmission to FEC.

2.17 Where the FEC considers that the issues raised by the data would benefit from wider discussion with relevant members of the College they will contact the Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement (or nominee) to arrange a meeting.

Submission of the Programme Enhancement Plan to the College

2.18 Faculties must submit parts A and B of their programme enhancement plans to QSE. A PEP scrutiny group will review all the plans submitted and provide feedback at a faculty level. Faculty representatives will form part of the scrutiny group, along with representatives from King’s Academy, Careers and Employability, Quality, Standards and Enhancement, Student Success and Social Mobility. The FEC and the scrutiny group will pay particular attention to programmes which receive a red RAG rating. Plans will also be made available to the Vice-President and Vice-Principal (Education)’s attention if they merit further scrutiny either because of good practice or because the number of negative flags raised.

2.19 Faculties and officers in QSE can suggest a meeting should be held with relevant stakeholders within the College to discuss how the programme(s) can be supported. Where a FEC deems a meeting is required they should contact the Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement to discuss. Separate meetings will be held for UG and PGT programmes in order to ensure timely consideration of any areas requiring discussion. Were a number of programmes in the same department to have negative flags and action plans that would merit discussion, there would be just one meeting to cover all programmes.

2.20 Where a programme has a high number of positive flags a member of College Senior Management might choose to convene a meeting with members of the department to discuss any good practice that could be shared more widely across the College.

2.21 The Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement will produce overarching programme enhancement reports for UG and PGT programmes for discussion at CEC based on the discussions, conclusions and recommendations made by the scrutiny group.

2.22 There will be two rounds of reporting to CEC to reflect the submission dates for different parts of the PEPs. The earlier report will include an

- overview of outputs from programme enhancement planning. This will include evidence/an assessment of the impact of the previous year’s planning on the student experience and an overview of the key areas of focus for the following year.
- overview of good practice emerging from programme enhancement planning which needs to be brought to the attention of the wider College.

The second report will provide an

---

3 Could be FEC meeting, sub-committee of FEC, or by a sub-group of FEC members

4 Separate submissions timelines have been agreed for Part A and Part B
• overview of the data. This will include themes arising from the data and an overview of how the data was reported on.

The Head of Collaborative Provision will produce a separate report which focuses on collaborative provision arrangements for discussion by Collaborative Provision Sub Committee and for note at CEC.

**Timescales**

2.23 Faculties must submit parts A and B of their programme enhancement plan to QSE (asq@kcl.ac.uk) following detailed scrutiny by their FEC by the following dates:

- UG - Part A should be submitted by 31st October 2019 and part B by 28 February 2020.
- PGT- PGT programmes Part A should be submitted by 31st October 2019 and Part B by 31 March 2020.

2.24 Timescales for submission of programme enhancement plan is agreed by the Faculty but they must have sufficient time to enable the final report to be submitted to Quality, Standards and Enhancement.
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Process flow diagram

Strategy, Planning and Analytics make data available on data dashboard according to the Calendar on the front page of the dashboard. UG and PGT from July each year.

Head of Department (or nominee) writes a Programme Enhancement Plan (PEP) in consultation with students which includes an update on last year's PEP. The plan must include all programmes within the department. Part A forms the enhancement plan and becomes a "live" document; Part B responds to the data on the dashboard.

Head of Department sends the full Programme Enhancement Plan to the Faculty Education Committee for approval.

FEC approves the PEP and sends Parts A (both UG and PGT) to Quality, Standards and Enhancement (asq@kcl.ac.uk) by 31 October 2018. The FEC may/may not request a meeting with the VP (Ed).


Part A of the Department's plan remains a "live document" and is periodically reviewed by FEC (or another forum with student representation).

Faculty Education Committee declines Programme Enhancement Plan and returns back to the Department for further work. When resubmitted and approved by the FEC, the FEC sends Parts A (both UG and PGT) to Quality, Standards and Enhancement (asq@kcl.ac.uk) by 31 October 2018. The FEC may/may not request a meeting with the VP (Ed).

The FEC submits UG Part B by 28 Feb 2020 and PGT Part B by 31 March 2020

Part A of the Department's plan remains a "live document" and is periodically reviewed by Faculty Education Committee (or another forum with student representation).

The PEP Scrutiny Group convenes to discuss the PEPs

PEP Scrutiny Group confirms PEP has been adequately completed. There are no negative flags, nor a request by the Faculty for a higher level meeting – process ends.

PEP Scrutiny Group confirms PEP has adequately covered negative flags and the Faculty have noted no need for a higher level meeting – process ends.

PEP Scrutiny Group confirms PEP has been completed and the Faculty have identified a higher level meeting is required – VP (Ed) Education and Associate Director QSE issue to arrange a meeting and agree participants.

PEP Scrutiny Group does not conclude that PEP has adequately covered negative flags, nor has the Faculty identified a higher level meeting is required – member of College Senior Management will convene a meeting with the department

College member of Senior Management identifies good practice noted in the report and wishes to meet with department – meeting is convened by member of College Senior Management.

PEP Scrutiny Group provides feedback to individual PEP reports and sends to Faculty Vice Dean Education

QSE writes UG and PGT overview reports for College Education Committee. Head of Collaborative Provision writes report for Collaborative Provision Sub Committee.
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Section E
Procedures for postgraduate research degrees approval and monitoring
1. New research degree programmes – approval process

1.1 Proposals to introduce new research degree programmes should be made on the appropriate form (see below for further information). This process relates only to new programmes for awards already offered by the College. For programmes that will lead to an award not currently offered by the College, please contact the Centre for Doctoral Studies in the first instance, as new awards and award titles require approval by Academic Board.

1.2 All new programme proposals, except collaborative activity, must seek approval via the following method:

   a) Proposers must complete the Proposal for a New Research Programme form and discuss this at the relevant Faculty Research Committee
   b) Once approved in principle the form must be referred to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for approval via the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee (PRSS).

1.3 Where the programme proposal involves blended learning or the structure differs to the standard 3/4 years, proposers must complete the Proposal for a New Research Programme form (blended or non-standard) and seek approval via the relevant Faculty Research Committee and PRSS.

1.4 Programme proposals that involve collaborative activity (e.g. joint PhDs) must seek approval via the following method:

   (a) Check if there is an existing partnership and Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in place by speaking to the Global Engagement Office (for international partners);
   (b) Complete the Proposal for a New Research Programme (joint PhD) form and discuss this at the relevant Faculty Research Committee;
   (c) Once approved in principle the form must be referred to Global Engagement and the Centre for Doctoral Studies for information;
   (d) The Global Engagement Office will liaise with the partner institution to complete the due diligence process, including the Ethical & Reputational Risk Review (ERRR) and the Memorandum of Understanding (if necessary). This will be approved via the College International Committee (CIC);
   (e) Proposals that are deemed high risk or involve arrangements that are outside of the norm will be referred to the Collaborative Provision Subcommittee for additional scrutiny;
   (f) Once partner approval is confirmed and the MoU is signed, Global Engagement will liaise with the partner institution to complete a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA). At the same time the proposer can begin drafting the Schedule of Activity in liaison with the partner and with assistance from the Centre for Doctoral Studies.
   (g) Once completed, the Proposal for a New Research Programme (joint PhD) form, MoA and Schedule of Activity must be submitted to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for final scrutiny before being referred to PRSS for final approval.

1.5 The following information in support of requests for new research degree programmes is required:

   (a) The academic rationale for the introduction of the new programme, including the scope and scale of the related academic activity in the proposing department(s);
   (b) The way in which the new programme complements existing programmes already offered;
   (c) The research environment that will be available to students, in particular whether they will be part of a critical mass of students and have access to research seminars;
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(d) The potential recruitment benefits of the new programme;
(e) Anticipated student numbers, including any existing students who may wish to transfer to study under the new programme title.

1.6 Where a programme includes a taught element, such as a professional doctorate, please refer to Section B of this Handbook, Procedures for programme and module approval and modification, for approval of the taught aspects of the programme.

2. PhD by blended learning

2.1 The College will offer PhD programmes by blended learning (distance and e-learning) where a department/division is able to make a case that there are suitable students who would benefit from this arrangement. Departments/divisions should direct this case to the Dean for Doctoral Studies for consideration in the first instance.

2.2 The College needs to ensure that any such programmes meet the standards and deliver the quality of student experience for which King’s conventional programmes are renowned. The College therefore needs to ensure that, until experience of the arrangement has built up, all PhDs programmes to be offered by blended learning are approved individually and are monitored for the quality of their delivery.

2.3 Once the College has more experience in delivering such programmes and a track record of successful delivery, programme approval can become light touch.

2.4 The following basic principles will apply in respect of PhD by blended learning:

(a) Non-residential students will be registered full time for the normal period of candidacy and will pay full fees;
(b) Students should be interviewed carefully to ensure that they are personally suited to independent study that will involve some isolation. Only students thought to be capable of handling such potential isolation and thought to be highly self-motivated should be considered for non-residential study;
(c) Every potential non-residential student should undertake a learning needs analysis before enrolment to ensure that they already possess, or can show that they have the opportunities to acquire, the generic and transferable skills necessary to complete their PhD successfully and progress in their career. Where students do not possess these skills and cannot acquire them through presence on courses or through e-learning they should not be admitted;
(d) Each programme should have an intensive period of induction requiring attendance at the College; typically this will be of one month’s duration;
(e) It is vital that supervisors keep in regular contact with non-residential students, preferably at least once per fortnight. This will ensure that signs that a student is becoming demotivated or isolated can be picked up at the earliest opportunity. Supervisors should log the date of each interaction and keep a written record of discussions.

2.5 Each department/division wishing to offer distance PhDs should complete the Proposal for a New Research Programme (blended or non-standard) form available via the Centre for Doctoral Studies, which specifies how the risk factors inherent in delivery by blended learning have been mitigated. This must be approved by the faculty.

2.6 The form will then be considered by the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee which will recommend its approval or modification.
2.7 The Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee will review evidence annually to ensure the programme is meeting the College’s standards and delivering an appropriate student experience. That subcommittee will request certain information (e.g. on student progress) that the programme co-ordinator will need to supply in advance.

2.8 Once the programme has run successfully for four years and has delivered submission and completion rates that are in line with conventional PhD programmes in that discipline then separate annual monitoring will cease.

3. Monitoring of postgraduate research degrees

3.1 An annual report from each faculty in respect of research degrees is submitted to the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee.

3.2 For joint award research degrees a separate annual report from the Joint Academic Committee (JAC) is required to be submitted to the Centre for Doctoral Studies for consideration by the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee.
Section F
Core code of practice for PGT research governance and the dissertation framework
1. Introduction

1.1 This Core Code sets out the policy of King’s College London on good practice in all matters concerning postgraduate taught dissertations. A copy of the Core Code will be made available to all postgraduate students and supervisors on an annual basis. It will be reviewed annually by the College Education Committee.

1.2 The Core Code should be read in conjunction with the guidelines set out in the appropriate Faculty (Institute/School) and Departmental or student handbook, the relevant ‘Academic regulations’, ‘Regulations concerning students and General regulations’ of King’s College London, procedures for quality assurance of taught programmes published under the authority of the Academic Board of the College and programme specifications.

1.3 The term ‘research’ in the Core Code has been interpreted in its broadest sense and may encompass a range of data-collection methods. The different types of dissertation adopted by the College and covered in this Code can be found in Appendix 1.

1.4 Supervision of postgraduate taught students is influenced by many factors including the individuals involved, the type of work, the discipline, the size of the department and the environment in which students and supervisors work. Some variation across an institution as large and complex as the College is therefore inevitable. Faculty (Institute/School) practice may, therefore strengthen and build upon the Core Code, which should be seen as laying down the minimum standards expected.

2. Purpose of the Core Code

2.1 The purpose of this Core Code is to provide a framework for the effective management and implementation of good practice in all matters relating to postgraduate taught research activities at King’s College London.

2.2 It aims to ensure that all students are effectively supported and supervised so that:

- A research dissertation/project appropriate to study at level 7 study is made available/agreed with the student
- The potential of the student as a researcher may be developed.
- The dissertation/project is submitted within the timeframe laid down by the programme

2.3 It should be noted that it is the student’s responsibility to ensure that their work is submitted on time and of a satisfactory standard to achieve at least a pass.

---

34 This will be via an electronic copy of the document that can be downloaded at: https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/student/grad-school/ptg/index.aspx
35 2018/19 The Academic Standards Sub-committee agreed that a working group should be established to review dissertations in 2019/20. Due to this the annual review normally completed was deferred until this working group has met.
36 The word “department” is used throughout the Core Code to refer to departments, divisions, research group or other units within a Faculty/School/Institute that are responsible for postgraduate taught students
37 Some faculties may have module dissertation handbooks
38 https://www.kcl.ac.uk/campuslife/acservices/Academic-Regulations
39 The word dissertation and project are used interchangeably throughout this document
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2.4 The roles and responsibilities of those involved in postgraduate taught research activities are provided in Appendix 3.

2.5 The Core Code sets out the minimum threshold expectations; Faculties (Institutes/School) may seek approval from the Quality, Standards and Enhancement (QSE) office to supplement and build upon the Core Code.

3. The format of a master’s research dissertation

3.1 The research project is a core requirement for a taught Master’s degree at King’s and is the key element distinguishing the Master’s degree from a professional certificate or postgraduate diploma programme.

3.2 The structure of a taught master’s programme in the College varies and may differ from the traditional format that it is taken over 1 calendar year Full Time or 2 years Part Time.

3.3 This normally comprises a workload over 45-46 weeks plus holidays, to average 40 hours per week. This equates to a total of 180 credits at ‘M’ level, of which the taught master’s research dissertation forms a significant component, usually 60 credits (as described in Appendix 1).

3.4 Details of the structure and format of the taught Master’s research project should be documented in a student/dissertation handbook.

3.5 Word count limits would normally include footnotes and endnotes. It does not include bibliography, references, or appendices unless otherwise specified in student handbooks.

4. Supervision

4.1 Normally each student pursuing a dissertation will be allocated a research supervisor. Some programmes utilise a research practice project model; students on these programmes will have their work on this project overseen by a module convener rather than a supervisor (further details can be found in Appendix 3).

4.2 Supervisors and module convenors should consult the College Core Code (and where appropriate their Faculty (Institute/School) for guidance on policy, regulation and good practice relating to the supervision of students.

4.3 Supervisors and module convenors should hold regular supervision meetings with their students, on an individual or a collective basis dependent upon the dissertation model (Appendix 1), and where deemed necessary should keep a record of those meetings. Supervisors may require students to provide this formal record.

4.4 For programmes delivered online similar arrangements will need to be made electronically.

4.5 When a student’s supervisor is unable to perform their required supervisory duties for more than one month, s/he should inform the student and appropriate authority within the

---

40 MRes degrees have different requirements as shown in Appendix 1
41 Professional programmes such as those in the Dental Institute, Physiotherapy and Medical Engineering may run over 2-4 years in accordance with professional body requirements. 1+3 programmes such as the MPhil Stud in Philosophy
42 This may occur in the Dickson Poon School of Law
43 Happening over a period of time to establish a pattern, though not necessarily a strict one
Faculty (Institute/School) and make appropriate arrangements for cover. The Head of Department/Division should ensure that appropriate cover is provided.

4.6 Heads of Department or a delegated named representative are responsible for making appropriate arrangements in the case of students changing or wishing to change, their supervisor, where it is deemed necessary.

4.7 Heads of Department or a delegated named representative are responsible for ensuring that students are aware of their responsibilities in relation to the Health and Safety at Work Act, occupational health clearance, CRB checks and visa requirements where appropriate.

4.8 Students are responsible for the submission of their dissertation and are permitted to submit their work in the absence of approval from the supervisor. Programmes that require dissertations to be ‘signed-off’ by the supervisor must provide details of this process in the module handbook.

4.9 It is the student’s responsibility to make sure the research dissertation is submitted on time (Appendix 3)

5. Ethical approval and statutory requirements

5.1 Supervisors and module convenors should notify students of their obligation to obtain ethical approval. Ethical approval is required for all research that involves human participants. This is sometimes applicable to the use of data derived from humans. Studies, requiring ethical review, must not begin without full approval. Students should be aware that this is a mandatory requirement of the College and that conducting research without such approval constitutes misconduct.

5.2 Students may sometimes require ethical approval for the re-use of secondary data. This is appropriate if the data is sensitive, or identifies individuals. Some research work can be socially or environmentally sensitive. This may also require approval. The College web-pages provide more information about further analysis of pre-existing data.

http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/ethics/about/index.aspx

5.3 Some research studies are subject to external ethical review. This is due to legal or other governance requirements. Such studies do not usually require approval from the College. For example, the NHS has its own research ethics committees (NHS RECs). In such cases supervisors have responsibility for ensuring that students have ethical approval and that other statutory requirements such as for GM work and animal work are in place.

5.4 Research which does not fall under the remit of the NHS should be submitted to one of the review bodies accountable to the College Research Ethics Committee (where the project involves human participation in some form, or in certain cases use of data derived from humans).

https://www.kcl.ac.uk/research/support
This page will direct you to the correct review procedure for your Faculty (Institute/School).
6. Extensions

6.1 Overview

6.1.1 An extension is when a student’s submission is extended beyond the original deadline as set out by the academic regulations. The following provides details of the requirements and circumstances for seeking extensions of postgraduate taught research dissertation submission deadlines and advice when considering such requests.

6.1.2 Any request for an extension to a dissertation submission deadline must be made as soon as the student is aware that they will be unable to meet the original published deadline due to acceptable circumstances.

6.2 Applications for extension requests for submission deadlines must be approved at Programme/Departmental level. In order for an extension to a dissertation submission deadline to be approved, a Mitigating Circumstances Form must be submitted. Details for applying for an extension can be found at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/assessment/mitigating-circumstances/index

If at all possible the student should continue to work towards the original published deadline until the outcome of the extension request is known.

6.3 It is expected that the Programme/Department will reach a decision on the student’s request as soon as is reasonably possible.

6.4 Supervisors and/or the programme team should encourage students to discuss difficulties in meeting the deadline at the earliest opportunity. It is important that students on distance-learning programmes are aware of the regulations governing extensions and have easy access to the appropriate forms.

6.5 A request close to the original published deadline may not be considered until after the deadline has passed. In that situation the student should submit their work as soon as is reasonably possible after the deadline, even if they have not been notified of the outcome of their extension request.

The student should be aware that in such instances, if their reasons for requesting an extension are deemed unacceptable, their work will receive a mark dependent on the time that has passed since the original submission date.

6.6 Absences for relevant training or time spent in industry should not lead to an extension or change to the submission date.

6.7 Illness

6.7.1 If a student experiences ongoing medical/health problems throughout their studies but decides they do not wish to interrupt their studies, information must be kept on record in case an extension to their dissertation submission deadline is required nearer the time.

6.7.2 Short periods of absence through illness during the research period should be brought to the attention of the supervisor by the student and recorded by the programme team/supervisor and/or brought directly to the attention of the Chair of the Assessment

44 An Mitigating Circumstances Form can be found at: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/assessment/mitcir.aspx
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Sub-board\textsuperscript{45} as this may eventually have an impact on a student’s dissertation submission deadline, and without a record of such periods it will be difficult to grant an extension.

6.7.3 In all cases of medical/health problems medical certificates/doctors notes/counsellors’ reports must be provided by the student, noted by the research supervisor/programme team and kept on the student file for future reference if and when required by the Chair of the Assessment Sub-board. Without supporting documentation, an extension may not be granted.

6.7.4 Students learning by distance should be permitted to provide original medical documents/certificates and other supporting evidence electronically.

6.7.5 If an accident/unexplained illness that affects a student during or in the lead up to the submission of the dissertation the student must submit a mitigating circumstances form\textsuperscript{46}. The form can be submitted no later than 7 calendar days after the date of a missed deadline.

6.7.6 In cases of illness or injury that involve absences of more than two weeks, the student should inform the supervisor and/or programme team/department and medical certificates should be requested. Where a student is or is expected to be absent for more than two months, whether consequently or cumulatively then the appropriate administrative unit should be informed, and arrangements put in place to interrupt the programme of study where appropriate.

6.8 Other

6.8.1 For maternity leave, up to nine month’s interruption can be approved automatically and the date of research dissertation submission extended. Students can also apply for up to three further months, and again the date of submission would be extended. For paternity leave, students can take up to 10 days automatically (which will not affect the date of submission); students may also take up to 13 weeks within 12 months of birth or whatever is permitted by government legislation. If the additional time is taken, the date of submission will be extended by the appropriate period.

6.8.2 Where a student has experienced difficulties with their supervisor it is the responsibility of the Head of Department/Division or designated representative to deal with/rectify this as quickly as possible. Therefore, such circumstances, unless in extreme cases, should not be the sole grounds for seeking an extension.

7. Marking and formative feedback to students

7.1 All dissertations are to be double marked according to the College’s Marking Framework (Model 2). External examiners shall have sight of both markers feedback and marks, along with a note of how the final mark has been agreed.

7.2 The marking can be independent of the supervisor or supervisor-led but there should be a standardized department approach to the marking.

\textsuperscript{45}Previously known as Programme Board of Examiners

\textsuperscript{46}Mitigating Circumstances form can be found at:
https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/assessment/mitigating-circumstances/index
7.3 All students should be provided with one opportunity for receiving formative feedback prior to the final submission of the dissertation. This formative feedback can either be feedback of one chapter or feedback of numerous chapters. The Department should agree what approach to be taken.

8. Student Feedback

8.1 All Programmes are expected to have procedures in place to collect feedback from students regarding the dissertation experience and support infrastructure as a whole even if comprised of more than one module.

8.2 The College participates in the national Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES) which gives postgraduate taught students the particular opportunity to feedback their dissertation experience.\(^\text{47}\)

8.3 It is acknowledged that some students may not have started on their dissertations by the time PTES closes and that its value as a conduit for feedback in these cases may be limited.

8.4 However, where possible it is expected within this code of practice that note is made and action taken if necessary, by programme/department/ Faculty (Institutes/School) in response to feedback from students about their research experience.

9. Complaints and appeals

9.1 Students should refer to the Student complaints procedures if they are dissatisfied with any aspect of their studies.

9.2 Students whose registration is terminated for failure to make sufficient academic progress may appeal under the Academic Progress Regulations.\(^\text{48}\)

\(^{47}\) http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/ptes-home

\(^{48}\) http://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/index.aspx
Appendix 1: College Postgraduate Taught Dissertation Framework

Rationale
It is a College commitment that as a research-intensive university the development of an understanding of research methodology, design and practice should lie at the core of all masters’ programmes. In order to instigate greater clarity whilst ensuring probity and rigour across the College and in order to ensure that the research process is embedded within programmes in a fair and transparent manner the following types of dissertation should be adopted. Programmes will select the most appropriate type for their programmes with the overall aim of enabling students to demonstrate specialised understanding and independent critical evaluation.

In accordance with the QAA Masters Characteristics all Masters programmes must include an element of research as a core component of the programme as described by the following models.

Programmes included in the framework
Master of Science (MSc); Master of Arts (MA); Master Public Health (MPH); Master Teaching and Learning (MTL); Master of Laws (LLM); Master Business Administration (MBA); Master Clinical Dentistry (MClinDent) and Master Music (MMus)

Programmes must provide students with details of the specific dissertation(s) models that they intend to apply.

Word count limits would normally include footnotes and endnotes. It does not include bibliography, references, or appendices unless otherwise specified in student handbooks.

Model 1 - Original/empirical research dissertation
This model applies to those research projects undertaken in a laboratory as well as in clinical settings or elsewhere in the field and involves the collection and analysis of original data. This model also applies to the theoretical analysis of a mathematical problem involving original mathematical investigations, computer experiments such as particle phenomenology and or atomistic simulation. Ethical approval may be required for certain topics.

Credit value: 60. Max word limit: normally 15,000

Model 2 - Retrospective/secondary data research dissertation
This model applies to those research projects that make use of publically available electronic datasets or an existing dataset from previously undertaken local research. This model may also include the collection and analysis of retrospective clinical material or the theoretical analysis of a mathematical problem following the collection and analysis of data applied to existing mathematical models that are relevant for the problem itself. Ethical approval may be required for certain topics.

Credit value: 60. Max word limit: normally 15,000

As agreed by College Education Committee May 2017 a programme that has taught elements made up of 5 and 10 credits must have a 30 credit research methods module and 60 credit dissertation
Model 3 - Practice/performance evaluation research dissertation
This model applies to the analysis of practice and includes clinical audit and policy analysis as well as the critical appraisal of service development or healthcare provision. This model can also apply to the evaluation of the performance of laboratory equipment or comparison of difference analytical techniques.

Credit value: 60 Max word limit: normally 15,000

Model 4 - Composition-based research dissertation
This model is only applicable in fields such as music and digital humanities and the main outcome of the research is presented in a practical format. For music, this may take the form of a composition and/or performance material. For digital humanities, the project may be comprised of ‘software’ (normally conceived as a prototype or model) that expresses a significant part of the intellectual work, (e.g. a database design that models a real-world phenomenon that is being investigated).

In either case the candidate should submit in addition a textual component that establishes the research questions that govern the submission as a whole.

Credit value: 60 Max word limit: normally 7,500 (textual element)

Model 5 - Information/library-based research dissertation
This model applies to those research projects that are library-based and will involve the systematic review and/or meta-analysis of a specific topic. This model may also include the analysis of legal and/or philosophical sources demonstrating advanced skills in legal and/or philosophical analysis or a systematic review using information technology of the state of the art in theoretical physics or mathematics. A candidate may be required to include text that describes the method used for the evaluation and/or analysis of the knowledge base.

Credit value: 60 Max word limit: normally 15,000

Model 6 - Artefact construction and analysis dissertation
This model applies to fields such as Informatics, where an artefact is constructed with a view to answering a particular research question. The artefact can take a variety of forms, such as one or more algorithms; a formal mathematical model; representation formalisms to encode data, information or knowledge; software applications; a robot with control software; a design or; a theoretical model of framework; etc. A candidate may be required to provide a demonstration of the artefact and material related to the artefact, such as source code, installation instructions, and user evaluations.

Credit value: 60 Max word limit: normally 15,000
(Excluding installation instructions and user evaluations)

Model 7 – Professional/practice dissertation
This model applies to those research projects, which aim at furthering the professional development of students by offering a practice project. This model will enable the application of research to professional situations, and would require the candidate to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to professional activities. The practice-based research project can take different forms, such as the submission of a framework for documentation for clients/service users, or the critical evaluation of a practice-oriented case study.

Credit value: 40 or 45 Max word limit: normally 12,000
Credit value: 60 Max word limit: normally 15 000
Model 8 - Portfolio research dissertation of applied research learning and skills (King’s Online)

This model applies to the development and demonstration of knowledge and skills in research design, analysis and reporting, and primarily targeting those undertaking a King’s Online Managed Programme. This model will include modules to provide a set of core research-related knowledge and skills, that combine into a portfolio of applied learning. The portfolio-based research project may include the development of an application for human research ethics approval; critical appraisal of empirical literature; the development of a research methodology to examine research objectives and hypotheses; and the analysis of qualitative or quantitative data to meet research objectives or test a null hypothesis. Students may also be able to continue a single research topic across the four modules to build a portfolio.

Credit value: 60\(^{50}\) Max word limit: normally 15,000

Model 9 – Blended learning dissertation

This model applies to the development and demonstration of discipline specific knowledge and skills in research design, analysis and reporting. A candidate may take up to two online modules that describes research methodology and analytical tools used for the evaluation and/or analysis of the knowledge base. The candidate will study using a mixture of online and campus-based modules linked to critical research methodology and practice.

Credit value: 60\(^{51}\) Max Word Limit: normally 15,000

Model 10 - Online Professional or Practice Masters Degrees

This model applies to professional/practice oriented online programmes which integrate core research skills within taught modules. This is done in order to foster the ability to apply research to professional situations, both practical and theoretical, as well as the ability to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to professional activities. A richer suite of taught modules will be developed, resulting in demonstrated knowledge and skills that will be assessed and evidenced in both formative and summative assessments. A separate research methods online resource will normally be developed as a non-credit bearing element of the programme to support students.

Credit value: Integrated in a minimum of four taught modules

Max Word Limit: N/A (no specific piece of written work)

---

\(^{50}\) comprising 4 by 15 credit modules of learning

\(^{51}\) of which 2 x 15 credit modules are distance learning
Master of Research (MRes)

Background
It is a College commitment that as a research-intensive university the development of an understanding of research methodology, design and practice should lie at the core of all masters’ programmes. In order to instigate greater clarity whilst ensuring probity and rigour across the College the following models are adopted and programmes must provide students with details of the specific model(s) that they intend to apply.

In accordance with the QAA Masters Characteristics all Masters programmes must include an element of research as a core component of the programme as described by the following models.

Word count limits would normally include footnotes and endnotes. It does not include bibliography, references, or appendices unless otherwise specified in student handbooks.

MRes Model 1 - Original/Empirical Research Dissertation

This model applies to those research projects undertaken in a laboratory as well as in clinical settings or elsewhere in the field and involves the collection and analysis of original data. This model may also apply to the theoretical analysis of a mathematical problem involving original mathematical investigations. Ethical approval may be required for certain topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit value</th>
<th>Max word limit</th>
<th>Normally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MRes Model 2 - Information/Library-based Research Dissertation

This model applies to those research projects that are library-based and will involve the systematic review and/or meta-analysis of a specific topic. This model may also include the analysis of case law demonstrating advanced legal skills or a review of the state of the art in theoretical physics or mathematics. A candidate may be required to include text that describes the method used for the evaluation and/or analysis of the knowledge base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit value</th>
<th>Max word limit</th>
<th>Normally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MRes Model 3 - Retrospective/Secondary Data Research Dissertation

This model applies to those research projects that make use of publically available electronic datasets or an existing dataset from previously undertaken local research. This model may also include the collection and analysis of retrospective clinical material or the theoretical analysis of a mathematical problem following the collection and analysis of data applied to existing mathematical models that are relevant for the problem itself. Ethical approval may be required for certain topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit value</th>
<th>Max word limit</th>
<th>Normally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRes Model 4 - Laboratory Rotation Dissertation

This model applies to multiple research projects undertaken in different laboratories to acquire contemporary practical and theoretical knowledge and skills in distinct areas of relevance to the field of study, which cumulatively contribute the required proportion of credits to the whole programme. Projects may involve the collection and analysis of original data or review of a specific topic. Ethical approval may be required for certain topics.

Credit value: 45      Max word limit: normally 7,000
It is expected that student complete 2 or 3 such projects

Credit value: 60      Max word limit: normally 12,000
It is expected that students complete 2 such projects

MRes Model 5 - MRes embedded within a MRes-PhD programme

This model applies to multiple research projects undertaken in different laboratories to acquire contemporary practical and theoretical knowledge and skills in distinct areas of relevance to the field of study, which cumulatively contribute the required proportion of credits to the whole programme. Projects will involve the collection and/or analysis of original data. Ethical approval may be required for certain topics.

Credit value: 40      Max word limit: normally 7,000
It is expected that students complete 3 such projects
Appendix 2: What might be included in programme/module handbooks?

Section 1: A guide for Post Graduate Taught Programmes Research Supervision

1. Selection of project

The research project is a core requirement for a Master’s degree at King’s and is the key element distinguishing the Master’s degree from a professional certificate or postgraduate diploma programme.

The process for selection of a research project should be outlined in the handbook and in all cases it is strongly recommended that supervisors ask students to attempt to develop a project outline, once the topic of study has been agreed, so that both parties are clear about what is being undertaken from the outset.

2. Approval of research topic

If there is an internal process of project suitability the student should be made aware of this and the consequences should a project be deemed unsuitable.

3. Research Integrity

It should be noted that it is a mandatory requirement of the College that ‘all research involving human participants undertaken by staff and students of all levels must be ethically approved by an appropriate body’.

Further details on the circumstances where ethical approval is required and the application process for ethical approval at King’s can be found on the Research Ethics Office website (see Appendix 4).

All students who wish to undertake studies that will require ethical approval should be encouraged to try and make their research ethics applications as early as possible to allow time to obtain ethical approval. It should be noted that research must not commence in any form until full ethical approval has been granted, so supervisors must ensure that ethical approval is sought early on in the process of preparing for their research.

The supervisor is responsible for ensuring that ethical approval has been sought

4. The research process – what is expected of students

The research project provides the opportunity for a student to demonstrate specialised understanding of a particular literature, engagement with associated scholarly debates and the exercise of independent critical judgment.

The process of learning about research will also build other skills, notably extensive personal qualities of self-motivation, independence and creativity. The student should be made aware of the requirements of the module and be provided with written or electronic information to this end.

Students should also be given contact details for their supervisor, some indication of their role and the time commitment given to the supervision process.
5. **Assessment criteria and marking policy**

The criteria for the assessment of the research dissertation should be made available and clearly explained to the student at the onset of the module.

A copy of the marking policy should be clearly documented in the handbook.

6. **Feedback**

There are many ways in which a supervisor can give feedback to a student during the research process. This may happen naturally through general discourse in a tutorial or a group meeting. Feedback can also take place more formally through the provision of formative feedback on draft chapters. It is important that a student is aware of the different ways in which feedback will be given and that some consistency is apparent across the programme /department/School.
Appendix 3: Roles and responsibilities
The following aims to provide an outline of the key roles and responsibilities for all those involved with postgraduate taught research projects. It should be noted that these are not exhaustive and must be read in conjunction with the main body of the College Core Code of Practice for PGT research governance and dissertations framework (Core Code).
These may be added to from time to time and the most up-to-date version will be made available at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/Teaching/PGT-Code-of-Practice.aspx

Section A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities of the Faculty (Institute/School) PGT Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To familiarise themselves with the Core Code of Practice and other College documentation, including the Academic regulations, T Regulations concerning PGT students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure Faculty (Institute/School) postgraduate taught handbooks pertinent to the dissertation are reviewed annually and kept up to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To devise mechanisms to enable open and constructive feedback to be provided by both students and supervisors on the dissertation experience and support infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To advise students and supervisors of their responsibilities in relation to the Health and Safety at Work Act, ethical approval procedures, intellectual property rights, plagiarism regulations and occupation health clearance where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities of the Department and the Programme Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that research topics appropriate for master’s level study have been agreed for each student and that an appropriate supervisor is appointed, where appropriate, within the time specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the case of breakdown of relations between a supervisor and the student and in other circumstances where a change of supervisor is desirable, to give advice in strict confidence, to assist in resolving any difficulties and, where necessary, to arrange the appointment of a replacement supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where a supervisor leaves the College’s employment, ensure suitable arrangements are in place so that the student receives appropriate support and supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cases of absence or the departure of the supervisor, ensure that adequate arrangements are made for the student’s continuing supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department/Programme Leader/Convenors should also be aware of the reporting responsibilities the College has in respect of overseas students on Tier 4 student visas. Guidance is provided at: <a href="https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/student/visa-compliance/Attendance-Monitoring/attendance-monitoring">https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/student/visa-compliance/Attendance-Monitoring/attendance-monitoring</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities of the Head of Department/Division/Programme Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To exercise overall responsibility for the welfare and academic progress of the postgraduate taught students in the Department/Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To exercise responsibility for safety and provide appropriate training and information through the nominated safety officer (if appropriate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that the requirements set out in the Core Code of Practice are followed and in particular to ensure that the procedures for effective supervision are adhered to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To delegate, where appropriate, responsibility for the organisation of postgraduate taught research dissertation/projects study in the Department/Division to a nominated person and/or Department/Divisional committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To familiarise themselves with College documentation pertinent to PGT students including the Academic regulations, T Regulations concerning students, General regulations, and Faculty (Institutes/School) postgraduate taught handbooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deal with issues which arise when students have problems, and help to solve these problems. This may include requesting suspensions of regulations, authorising extension of submission deadlines, interruption of studies, changing supervisors or withdrawing the student’s registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deal with the first stage of complaints raised by students or supervisors, working with the Faculty (Institute/School) PGT lead if necessary who will pass unresolved complaints to the office of the Director of Students and Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C

#### Responsibilities of the Faculty, School, Institute PGT Lead

These PGT leads have delegated responsibility from the Executive Dean of the Faculty (Institute/School) to represent and further the interests of postgraduate taught students within their Faculty (Institute/School) and oversee matters relating to educational experience.

#### Quality assurance and enhancement

These leads advise the Faculty (Institute/School) Education Committee on enhancements to the Core Code, who in turn report to College Education Committee. These leads will ensure that supervisors, module convenors and Heads of Department/Division in the Faculty (Institute/School) are made aware of the policies of the Faculty (Institute/School) and College, as represented by the College Regulations, Core Code of practice and specific Faculty/School/Institute provision/handbooks.

These leads will ensure that Heads of Department/Division and individual supervisors conform to College and Faculty (Institute/School) requirements and recommendations.

These leads will help to disseminate good practice identified with regard to PGT research within and outside the College.

#### Problem solving and complaints

Normally issues which arise when students have problems will be dealt with at programme and/or departmental level. The PGT lead will be expected to help when issues are unsolved. This may include requesting suspensions of regulations, authorising extension of submission deadlines, interruption of studies, changing supervisors or withdrawing the student’s registration.

Faculty (Institute/School) PGT leads or a delegated named representative deal with unresolved first stage of complaints raised by students, passing unsettled complaints to the office of the Director of Students and Education.
Core Code of Practice for PGT research governance and the dissertation framework

Section D

Responsibilities of the supervisor/module convenors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Each student will be allocated a research supervisor at an appropriate point in the programme. Module convenors will assume this role for Programmes that operate a practice-based research project model in place of a dissertation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A suitable dissertation topic will be agreed. There are several mechanisms in place to achieve this goal in Faculties (Institutes/School). Some programmes produce lists and award projects on a first-come, first-served basis, others allocate the supervisor first and then the student and supervisor arrive at the dissertation project. The process should be made clear to the student in the programme handbook and particularly for online for distance-learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors / module convenors are required to assess the feasibility of the project (if necessary) to ensure that it can be completed within the prescribed time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the supervisor’s / module convenors responsibility to make available advice on a project which can be completed successfully and on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors / module convenors should notify students of their obligation to obtain ethical approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors / module convenors should also confirm that all equipment, facilities and technical support, where appropriate, needed for the timely completion of the dissertation will be in place when the student needs them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early guidance on project

At the start of a student’s research dissertation, supervisors / module convenors should where appropriate give guidance about the nature and planning of the project and the standard expected, about literature and sources, about requisite techniques (and access to training where appropriate) and about the legal, ethical and professional norms of research (including requirements for formal approach such as ethical review of research with human participants).

Contact with students

Supervisors should be available for students throughout the dissertation period or nominate an academic colleague who is responsible and contactable when absent. Ideally contact should be maintained by the supervisor (or academic nominee) through regular, individual, or group meetings to be scheduled after discussion with the student(s) concerned.

Details of contact information should be shared where possible at the start of the dissertation process. This is particularly important if the student or the supervisor is based off-site.

Where physical presence at the College is not necessarily appropriate, contact may be maintained via telephone, email contact, Skype or other appropriate medium.

Supervisors have the right to require a student’s presence on campus (in London) in line with programme regulations.
Supervisors need to ensure that regular contact is maintained with students who are undertaking a period of “off-campus” study and that a named individual is in place “off-campus” for support as needed. Distance Learners and students “off-campus” and conducting research in another organisation (overseas, in industrial settings or in clinical settings etc.) should know who to contact in an emergency.

Supervisors should be contactable during the summer months and should notify students of intended holiday periods when contact would not be possible.

Supervisors are reminded to take particular care with regard to overseas students who, in the early stages, may need very frequent contact and advice. Supervisors should provide guidance as to where to get help with language problems and advice about language training where necessary. The English Language Centre can provide additional support for students with academic writing as well as language skills. Details can be found at: [https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/student/study/elc/ELC](https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/student/study/elc/ELC)
### Section E

#### Responsibilities of the student

##### Understanding of regulations

Students are required to familiarise themselves with the *Core Code* and other College documentation including the *Regulations for taught programmes*, *T Regulations concerning students* and *General regulations* and any Faculty (Institutes/School) postgraduate handbooks.

Students should be aware of their responsibilities in relation to the Health and Safety at Work Act, ethical approval procedures, intellectual property rights, plagiarism regulations and occupation health clearance where appropriate.

##### Contact with supervisor

Students should discuss with their supervisors the type of guidance required and must maintain regular contact with their supervisor throughout the dissertation.

Normally contact should be maintained through regular meetings to be scheduled after discussion with the supervisor. However, where physical presence at the College is not necessary or appropriate, contact may be maintained via telephone, email, Skype or other appropriate medium.

Students should notify their supervisors of intended holiday periods when contact would not be possible.

A timetable of meetings should may be arranged at the start of the dissertation period.

Students may be asked to keep a record of when supervisory meetings take place and the agreed action points for the student and supervisor that arose from the meeting.

Students must ensure that contact is maintained with their supervisor. This is particularly important for distance-learners and during any periods of “off-campus” study.

It is the responsibility of the student to keep the supervisor informed of any changes in personal or other circumstances that might affect the progress of work.

Students should take the initiative in raising problems which have arisen in the work.

##### Change of circumstances

Students are required to inform supervisors and the Programme Team/ Department/Division, as well as the appropriate administrative unit of any change of address, email and other contact details.

Any changes to circumstance that may affect a student’s progress must also be reported as early as possible.
Appendix 4: Research Ethics

All research carried out within the College should be conducted with integrity and in line with generally accepted ethical principles. This applies to research conducted by all staff and students. It is a mandatory requirement of the College that all research involving human participants, and in some cases their data or tissue, is subject to an appropriate ethical review. This is to protect the participants and the researchers. For further advice on good research conduct and research integrity visit: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/conduct/index.aspx

Additionally, there is a widening body of professional, regulatory and legal requirements which touch upon the ethical conduct of research with human participants. The ethics application process is designed to assist staff and students in identifying what these issues might be and how best they might be addressed.

College Review
All research which involves human participants, and in some cases their data or tissue, but does not fall under the remit of the HRA should be submitted via one of the approval processes accountable to the College Research Ethics Committee. For further information on the procedure that you should follow please visit http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/ethics/applications/index.aspx

HRA Review
If the research falls under the review requirements of the HRA then ethical review will be required from one of the Research Ethics Committees that falls within it, namely NHS REC, Ministry of Defence REC (MoDREC) or Social Care REC. To find out more about the HRA and its associated RECs visit http://www.hra.nhs.uk/about-the-hra/our-plans-and-projects/assessment-approval/

If you apply to any of the above mentioned RECs you do not need to apply for College approval as well although you may be asked to provide evidence of your ethical approval.

Review by other Institutions
All research which is sponsored and led by the College will be expected to have been subjected to one of the above review processes.

It is possible that in cases where research is conducted in collaboration with another institution, in the UK or overseas, this Institution may request that local ethical approval is sought. The College will endeavour, where possible, to accept the approvals of other Institutions without further review by the College. Acceptance of external approvals will be at the discretion of the College Research Ethics Committee and advice in such cases should be sought directly from the Research Ethics Office rec@kcl.ac.uk

Advice, guidance and training available
It is expected that the induction and training provided for research students will include the legal and ethical contexts of the research. It is also important that any students who may choose to conduct research with human participants are aware of the need to get ethical approval and are provided with the information and training they need should they decide to do so.

Training on research ethics, governance and integrity is outlined in the Graduate School training programme and will be provided on a faculty specific basis, upon request. For further details on training for your faculty please contact your faculty of office or the Research Ethics Office rec@kcl.ac.uk. More information can be found in the Training & Advice section of the Research Ethics web pages: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/research/support/ethics/training/index.aspx

Training is available for students, supervisors, staff researchers, research administrators.
Responsibilities
Under the College ethical review system the student is the named ‘Researcher’ and the Supervisor must then authorise any application form. Under the HRA system, doctoral students are the ‘Chief Investigator’, whereas for all other students the Supervisor takes this role. Regardless of this, it is expected that the Supervisor retains oversight of the student’s plans and does not authorise the application for submission until he/she is satisfied that it meets the standards required by the review body.

Other reasons why ethical review might be needed
There are some instances where research is not carried out directly with human participants but may still have social or environmental implications which warrant ethical review. An example of this would be the excavation of a burial site. If it is likely that planned research may present other ethical issues the student and supervisor should contact the Research Ethics Office (rec@kcl.ac.uk) to discuss this.

Marice Lunny
Head of Policy and Ethics March 2017
Appendix 5: Key resources and contacts

Students may seek help from Library Services at any time, including when they are preparing to conduct a literature review.

Help is available in every Library at the Enquiry Desks, See http://www.kcl.ac.uk/library/contact/index.aspx or email librarieservices@kcl.ac.uk

Specialist training sessions are run throughout the year, including literature searching, key resources in your subject, reference management (including Endnote and Refworks), systematic reviews and critical appraisal. Check the Library Services webpages for details of upcoming training: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/library/subjectsupport/trainingforyoursubject.aspx

There is a detailed guide for every subject that highlights key resources, training opportunities and contacts for support: http://libguides.kcl.ac.uk/

Other specific study skills can be sought from the English Language Centre (ELC) Study Skills http://www.kcl.ac.uk/study/elc/support/studyskills/index.aspx
Section G
Assessment and External Examiners
1. **Introduction to assessment**

1.1 The following information sets out the regulatory, quality assurance and procedural framework for the examination process.

1.2 The College awards degrees and other awards within the statutory framework of King’s College London and the quality assurance framework of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).

1.3 The College’s framework is determined by the *Academic regulations* available from here: [https://www.kcl.ac.uk/campuslife/acservices/Academic-Regulations](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/campuslife/acservices/Academic-Regulations)

1.4 The QAA has set out its expectations regarding the management of academic quality and standards in its *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*. Of particular relevance to the examination process is the [Advice and Guidance: Assessment](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/advice/guidance/assessment) and [Advice and Guidance: External expertise](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/advice/guidance/external-expertise).

1.5 A programme of study leading to an award will be examined within the College’s three-tier framework (a two-tier framework for single department Faculties (Institutes/School) or single-award Assessment Boards):

- Academic Standards Sub-committee - ASSC has delegated responsibility from the College Education Committee, for quality assurance matters concerning the examining of the College’s taught programmes (research assessment is the responsibility of the Postgraduate Research Students Sub-committee)
- Assessment Boards - there are two Boards per Faculty; one for undergraduate taught programmes and one for postgraduate taught programmes
- Assessment Sub-boards - each programme of study leading to an award must be assigned to an Assessment Sub-board

1.6 Standing to the side of the three-tier structure are additional assessment bodies that help ASSC discharge its responsibilities:

- Personalised Assessment Arrangements Committee - considers requests from students for special arrangements during examinations (e.g. extra time or special equipment) and requests for the sitting of examinations at alternative venues (e.g. overseas)

The main locus of responsibility for the determination of candidates’ results is at the level of the Assessment Sub-board with the Assessment Boards having a formal role in ratifying results. The Assessment Boards are charged, however, with considering special circumstances concerning candidates. Assessment Boards have an overarching responsibility for ensuring that each programme taught within the Faculty has an Assessment Sub-board appointed to examine its students and for ensuring that the examinations within the Faculty are conducted according to regulation and in a fair and impartial manner. The Assessment Boards also approve marking schemes within guidance set by ASSC.

---

52 During 2019/20 a pilot is being run where some Assessment Sub-boards have been given the role to ratify results, while the Assessment Board becomes involved in more strategic discussions relating to assessment
2. Setting of assessment

2.1 Assessment Sub-boards are responsible for the setting, scrutiny and approval of examination papers and other assessment. In setting assessment Examiners will need to consider the specified learning outcomes of the module and programme as set out in the programme and module specifications and the equal opportunities implications on the form of assessment chosen.

2.2 Assessment Sub-boards will select the most appropriate marking model for each assessment type in accordance with the College’s Marking framework and Assessment Boards will be responsible for ensuring that the Assessment Sub-boards have conducted their marking processes in accordance with the marking framework and the adopted marking models.

2.3 All assessments must be approved in advance of the examination by the external examiner(s) and a record kept of their approval.

2.4 Assessment Sub-boards should not set formal written examinations whose durations incorporate a quarter hour combination eg 1 hour 30 minutes rather than 1 hour 15 minutes. This will reduce disruption to candidates in the examination halls. Where possible, examinations should either be of two or three hours in duration.

2.5 Three times a year the Examinations Office will require, from the designated examination organiser in each department, details of the formal written examinations that are required to be scheduled during Exam Periods One (January), Two (May/June) and Three (August). Examination organisers will be able to find the following documents to assist them on the Examinations Office web pages:

- a note of guidance to prepare the examination paper proof;
- a specimen examination paper;
- a front cover template

2.6 Examination organisers will be required to submit to the Examinations Office, by the published deadlines:

- the examination timetable request form;
- proof examination paper(s).

2.7 Proof examination papers should be sent, via electronic means, to the Examinations Office.

2.8 The College expects high standards of professionalism in the examining process. Assessment Sub-boards are responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the proof and that appropriate measures are taken to protect the security of the written examination papers. The Examinations Office will only accept electronic copies of examination papers.

3. Marking, plagiarism and feedback

3.1 Regulations provide guidance on marking covering the protection of the identity of candidates and the distribution of scripts for marking.

3.2 Students who are absent from an examination without having been granted authorisation or who fail to submit material for assessment or who submit after the deadline without
authorisation should receive a mark of zero. Examiners are not required to mark illegible answers.

3.3 Generic marking criteria for written work are available (see Generic marking criteria: undergraduate and Generic marking criteria: taught postgraduate). Assessment Boards are encouraged to offer programme/subject specific criteria for assessment that map on to the generic criteria and these should be presented to the Assessment Board as part of the Board’s assessment scheme.

3.4 Assessment Boards assessment schemes should detail the local policies and variations permitted under the regulations covering:

- penalties/guidelines for exceeding word limits
- progression rules
- scheme(s) for the transfer of marks from another institution (see Translation of credits/marks attained through study away from the College)
- use of the various models in the Marking framework
- discipline specific marking criteria

3.5 The Regulations state that “the identity of students shall be withheld to examiners where possible”. Candidate numbers are issued to students by the Examination Office on an annual basis at the start of the academic year. Wherever practicable, summative assessment should be submitted using candidate numbers rather than names. Acceptable exceptions to this policy include practical examinations and assessment conducted for small cohorts where handwriting style or subject matter can easily be matched to a candidate.

3.6 It is important that candidates see anonymous marking as only one of the methods by which the integrity and fairness of the examination process are protected; other methods include double marking, moderation, the requirement that oral examinations be conducted by no less than two examiners acting together, the application of common marking criteria and the role of external examiners.

3.7 Where a student has been permitted personalised assessment provision, for most programmes, a note is attached to the completed examination script explaining to the examiner that the student has a specific learning disability and asking for this to be taken into account when marking for sentence structures and spelling. However some professional programmes do not permit the note to go with the examination script (for further information on personalised assessment arrangements see https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/staff/exams/PAA/index.aspx).

3.8 Prior to the start of the examination period the candidate number key will be emailed to the Chairs of the Assessment Sub-boards.

3.9 Departments/Faculties will need to ensure that marks arising from each examination period are recorded on the SITS database by the agreed deadline.

3.10 Any marks or comments on an examination script constitute ‘personal data’ which the candidate is entitled to see by submitting a subject access request (for which there is a special examination script pro-forma). Examiners should be judicious in their choice of language when writing on a script, in the knowledge that the student may gain sight of the script at a future date. Further information in respect of data protection can be found at: https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/about/secretariat/business-assurance/compliance/gdpr/GDPR-landing-page.aspx
3.11 The Academic Standards Sub-Committee has agreed a statement on academic honesty and integrity which sets plagiarism, collusion and cheating within the context of the academic community (see Academic honesty and integrity). Students will be required to sign and attach a statement to each piece of work submitted for assessment indicating that they have read and understood the College statement on plagiarism and that the assessment they are submitting is their own work.

3.12 Where an Examiner identifies a case of suspected plagiarism in assessed work or suspects any other form of cheating, s/he should refer the matter to the Chair of the relevant Assessment Sub-board. No mark should be assigned to the work and consideration of the student’s results should be held in abeyance until the matter has been resolved. Minor cases of plagiarism or similar (e.g. collusion) can be considered under the expedited examination misconduct procedure. For further information see Guidelines for examiners: plagiarism and related forms of cheating.

3.13 The College has agreed two policy documents on feedback: College policy on student feedback on assessment and College key principles to effective assessment feedback. Departments/Faculties should ensure students are familiar with the guidelines for receipt of feedback, and that feedback is provided to students in a timely manner, normally no longer than 4 weeks from the date of submission of coursework.

4. **External examiners**

4.1 Each Assessment Sub-board should ensure that they have an external examiner appointed. If an Assessment Sub-board wishes to have more than two external examiners appointed then a request must be made to the Chair of Academic Standards Sub-Committee (ASSC).

4.2 The nominated external examiner will be asked to complete the nomination form, and submit, along with their CV, the completed form to the Assessment Sub-board Chair (further information can be found at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/nomination). Once the form has been returned and finalised by the Assessment Sub-board Chair then the nomination is approved by both the Chair of the Assessment Board and the Chair of ASSC.

4.3 On approval of appointment, the external examiner will be sent an appointment letter, accompanied by relevant information relating to academic regulations, marking framework and marking criteria. In addition, the external examiner will be advised on local information to be provided by the Faculty, which includes:

- programme specifications
- marking schemes
- discipline specific marking criteria
- programme/module materials
- draft examination papers
- list of coursework title or coursework subject areas

4.4 The College will write to all external examiners annually, providing them with any updates to the regulations and procedures for that academic session.
4.5 All new external examiners should receive some form of orientation to the programme. This would normally be a session when the examiner is invited to meet the Assessment Sub-board chair and key members of staff involved with the delivery of the programme; such a meeting might also involve students (further information can be found at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/Assessment/External-Examiners-Support)

4.5 The main duties of the external examiner are provided in the regulations and are available at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/duties.

4.6 External examiners are required to electronically submit a written report (word format, not PDF) at the conclusion of each final examiners board on the appropriate form, which can be found at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/report. The report should be submitted within one calendar month of the meeting held to determine the results of candidates and examiners are required to sign the report to acknowledge that their report will be made available to students. It is only on receipt of the appropriate form will the external examiner get paid their annual fee.

4.7 If an external examiner fails to submit a report within two calendar months of the meeting held to determine the results of candidates, or respond to the three reminders sent by the QSE team, and there are no extenuating circumstances for this non submission, then a recommendation will be made to terminate the external examiner’s appointment.

4.8 Officers within the QSE Office will send the external examiner’s report to Executive Deans of Faculties, Assessment Board Chairs, Assessment Sub-board Chairs, Directors of Administration and Heads of Department.

4.9 External examiner reports will be made available to students via an internal webpage: https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/student/external-examiner-reports. Faculties will ensure that student representatives have an overview of external examiner reports, via notification of this webpage, Staff/Student Liaison Committees and/or Departmental Teaching Committees.

4.10 On receipt of the external examiner’s report, College officers, Assessment Board Chairs and Assessment Sub-board Chairs are required to submit a formal response, on the report that the external examiner has submitted. A diagram showing the full procedure for the consideration of External Examiners’ reports is overleaf.

4.11 For those reports that have identified an issue with academic standards or raised an issue for College attention, the reports must be returned to the external examiner within one month of receiving the report. Consultation must be held with the Chair of ASSC prior to the report being returned.

4.12 All reports are responded to and returned to the external examiner by the Assessment Sub-board Chair. Responded reports are then uploaded to the College’s SharePoint site for internal consideration.

4.13 Assessment Board Chairs and Quality Assurance Managers will be required to assist with the writing of Faculty annual reports, and adhere to the annual reporting process, as advised by College Education Committee.

4.14 Faculties will produce an overview report of external examiner reports received, summarising comments raised by external examiners that have been identified as impacting

---
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academic standards, or requiring attention at College or Faculty level, and any areas of good practice identified.

4.15 The Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement produces an overarching summary report, one for UG and one for PGT, for consideration by CEC and Academic Board on matters raised by External Examiners during that academic year.
5. **Diagram of the procedure for the consideration of external examiners’ reports**

- **QSE chases up any reports not received**
  - The External Examiners’ (EE) reports are received by the Quality, Standards and Enhancement (QSE) Section and the payment is sanctioned.

- **Non-academic issues are referred to the appropriate officers for comment/response.**

- **If Executive Dean of Faculty (or nominee) perceives a report to be a concern, they will liaise with Head of Department and Assessment Board Chair.**

- **For those reports with issues that impact on Academic Standards, the report should be completed and uploaded to the External Examiner SharePoint page within one month of receipt**

- **Faculties complete an overview report on those reports received and forwards the report onto the Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement**

- **Assessment Sub-board Chair reviews the reports and responds on SharePoint to issues raised. Once the response is complete the Assessment Sub-board Chair emails the Faulty (Institute/School) Assessment Board Chair.**

- **External Examiner reports, are considered as part of Faculty QA processes, by; Faculty (Institute/School) Assessment Boards; Faculty (Institute/School) Education Committees (or their equivalent) and Departmental Teaching Committees. Student representatives attend Faculty (Institute/School) Education Committees and Departmental Teaching Committees. Relevant issues may be referred to Staff Student Liaison Committees for discussion.**

- **QSE notifies the Chair of ASSC (on behalf of Vice-Principal (Education)) of reports with issues that impact on Academic Standards or matters raised for College attention for consideration.**

- **Any serious concerns and how they were addressed is reported to Academic Board via the overview report.**

- **QSE uploads the completed report to External Examiner SharePoint page that triggers an email to be sent to the External Examiner’s KCL email account.**

- **Completed reports are redacted and uploaded to the internal webpages for student view.**

- **Associate Director, Quality, Standards and Enhancement prepare the overview reports (for undergraduate, taught postgraduate and specialist doctorates) for submission to Academic Board.**
Section H
Short Courses Policy
Introduction

1. King’s College London is committed to sharing its knowledge with others. As a research intensive institution, we recognise knowledge exchange will form an important part of our research portfolio and understand that society benefits from how others use our knowledge. Such activity allows us to engage with and draw value from our external partners and stakeholders to enrich our knowledge. Moreover, it enhances our external profile. Accordingly, King’s encourages and supports staff in the development and delivery of short courses as a means of knowledge exchange.

2. King’s Professional and Executive Development (KPED) is the business unit that specialises in and promotes King’s short course activity. It has particular expertise in respect of Bespoke Executive Education.

3. The purpose of this policy is to support the development of short course activity, by providing clear guidelines and a transparent regulatory framework that covers financial, quality assurance and legal aspects on behalf of the institution. Section 9 of the Financial Procedures applies to all short courses as they are deemed non-standard teaching programmes.

4. For credit-bearing short courses it is expected that they will follow the College’s academic regulations, as academic credit will be given at the successful completion of the short course. For non-credit bearing short courses, where there is no academic credit involved, there is an expectation that summative assessment will not take place and therefore academic regulations do not apply. If a student has a complaint about a non-bearing short course however then they may follow the College’s regulations for handling complaints.

Definitions

5. The list below articulates the definitions of terms used within this policy:

**Bespoke Executive Education** – “closed” enrolment short courses designed specifically for an external partner

**Short Course** – a group of lectures/seminars/workshops, with articulated learning outcomes, completion of which leads to a certificate of attendance, and which may consist of 300 hours or less “learning time” (which includes contact hours, assessment (if credit-bearing), and self-directed study), but which is not an integral part of a degree programme. Examples of a short course include:

- **Credit-bearing short course** – a block of learning where credit is awarded that may be used towards an award of a higher education institution in the UK, in accordance with Kings’ academic regulations and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (FHEQ). These short courses are usually reported to HESA and a transcript detailing credit awarded will be provided alongside the certificate of attendance. A programme of study may use these short courses as Recognition of Prior Learning (sometimes known as a “free standing module”).

- **Non-credit bearing short course** - A group of lectures/seminars/workshops, with articulated learning outcomes, completion of which leads to a certificate of attendance only as no credits are attached. Some non-credit bearing short courses may
require assessment by admissions prior to being enrolled onto the short course and these will be advised to students.

**MOOC (Massive Open Online Course)** – A group of lectures/seminars/workshops, with articulated learning outcomes delivered entirely online. The MOOC can be either credit-bearing or non-credit bearing.

**Summer School** – A group of lectures/seminars/workshops offered by King’s in the UK or overseas that may be taken by registered King’s students and non-registered students during the summer vacation.

**Statements Applying to All Short Courses**

6. Short-courses offered by King’s College London can be non-credit-bearing or consist of 5, 10, 15, 20, or 30 academic credits.

7. All students participating in non-credit-bearing short courses will receive a ‘certificate of attendance’ signalling participation in the course; these certificates do not necessarily indicate successful completion of that course. Students participating in credit-bearing short courses who successfully complete the course will receive a certificate indicating their achievement and the credit awarded.

8. Short courses will typically have the following features:
   - They provide education and training to individuals and organisations in the public and private sectors;
   - They provide a financial return to departments, divisions or faculties;
   - They recruit students for whom King’s does not receive funding via HEFCE
   - They can be delivered in part or wholly via distance or e-learning

9. The delivery of teaching for short-courses may include:
   - Seminars, lectures and workshops
   - Professional and executive development programmes including master classes and study days
   - Evening classes
   - Modules of postgraduate programmes offered on an open enrolment “stand-alone” or “taster” basis
   - MOOCs

10. For both credit-bearing and non-credit bearing short courses that are delivered and assessed within faculties the approval mechanism resides with the faculty. The Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee should only receive a listing of approved short courses. Where a short course is jointly delivered across faculties all faculties involved should approve the short course. Approval of the business case shall reside within the home faculty.

11. For short courses delivered by units outside of the faculty structure or courses delivered by King’s Health Partners (credit bearing only) academic approval for the delivery of the short course will be the responsibility of the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee, while approval for any business case will be the responsibility of King’s

---

54 Faculties may offer 5 or 10 credits at PG level only
55 King’s Health Partners have been granted permission by Academic Board to offer 5 and 10 credits
56 For the purposes of this document “Faculty” includes the Dental Institute, Dickson Poon School of Law and Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience (IoPPN)
Professional and Executive Development. For non-credit bearing short courses delivered by King’s Health Partners, these are approved by King’s Health Partners with no formal reporting mechanism required to the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee.

12. Proposals for the delivery of short courses for external clients shall require King’s Professional & Executive Development (KPED) approval. Proposals for short courses produced for external clients must have a legal contractual basis and contracts must be negotiated and signed by the appropriate authorised King’s personnel. KPED will lead on client and contractual negotiations, and ensure financial and legal compliance on behalf of the institution.

13. Short courses delivered under the aegis of a body other than King’s College London, such as NHS Hospital Trusts or the London Deanery (for example Section 63 Dental Institute courses) will only be subject to this Policy if they require credit awarded by the College. Where approval for these short courses has been given they should be reported to the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee, as part of the faculty report.

14. Approval for MOOCs currently is overseen by the MOOC Steering Group. Any MOOCs approved by this Steering Group should be reported to the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee. If the MOOC is credit-bearing final approval is given by the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee, if non-faculty based.

15. Approval for a short course may be denied for a range of reasons, including lack of financial viability, staff workload, failure to meet appropriate academic standards and/or failure to comply with the King’s regulatory and quality assurance framework.

16. Where a short course proposed by a faculty is offered in a discipline that potentially overlaps with courses offered by another faculty then the approval of the Executive Dean of that Faculty must be obtained before the proposal can be approved.

17. Each short course shall submit annually to the College Education Committee details of feedback received, or confirmation that annual monitoring of the short courses fell under the remit of the College’s programme annual monitoring process (see paragraphs 22 and 23 below for further information).

Statements Applying to Credit Bearing Short Courses

18. Short course proposals seeking approval as credit-bearing courses shall require the submission of the following additional information:

- Mapping of learning outcomes against SEEC level descriptors (please see http://www.seec.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/SEEC-descriptors-2016.pdf), and the Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF)\footnote{The Qualifications and Credit Framework (QCF) is a new credit transfer system which has replaced the National Qualification Framework (NQF).} which articulate the requirements of learning outcomes at each different level (i.e., levels 3, 4, 5 and 6 which equate to the three years of an undergraduate degree, and level 7 which equates to a taught postgraduate programme.
- Assessment methodology

19. The Faculty Education Committee or Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee (see paragraphs 10 and 11 above) shall consider whether the learning outcomes, assessment
methodology and the amount of credit proposed is appropriate according to the College credit framework. Each credit-bearing short course shall adhere to the College’s regulations e.g. enrolment requirements, resit arrangements, appeals/complaints etc.

20. Each credit-bearing short course must be assigned to an appropriate assessment sub-board: short courses may be assigned to an existing assessment sub-board\(^{58}\). Existing external examiners must be notified of any addition to their duties in such circumstances.

21. Each fee-based short course must produce a *Programme Information Sheet*\(^{59}\) and course-book, made available to all students on the course. For the course book the following must be outlined, at a minimum:

- The aims, objectives and learning outcomes for the course;
- The curriculum for the course;
- The assessment requirements of the course;
- The timetable for the course;
- The learning resources available to students on the course;
- Procedures for appeals and complaints

22. For faculty-based short courses monitoring of the short course resides within the faculty (including MOOCs).

23. If the credit-bearing short course:

- Forms part of a programme then this monitoring is undertaken by the overarching programme enhancement process, and noted to the College Education Committee
- Sits outside of a programme then the short course annual report template form is completed and submitted to the faculty, with a note being made to the College Education Committee.

For non-credit bearing short courses the evaluation form completed at the end of the course shall be submitted to the faculty and noted to the College Education Committee.

23. For short courses that sit outside of faculty structures or those credit-bearing short courses delivered by King’s Heath Partners the following shall apply:

- Credit-bearing short courses will complete the short course annual report template form and submit it to the College Education Committee
- Non-credit bearing short courses monitoring is undertaken via the evaluation form completed by participants at the end of the course, which is submitted to the College Education Committee.

---

\(^{58}\) A Short Courses and Study Abroad Assessment Board has been established for those credit-bearing short courses that sit outside of faculty structure.

\(^{59}\) For compliance with Competition and Markets Authority
Appendix 1: Funding

Short Course Financial Statements

24. Short-courses must generate a positive return for King’s and target a contribution of c50% (i.e. income less direct costs). Exceptions to this will require the approval of the Executive Dean of Faculty and the Director of Management Accounting.

25. The business case should include the marginal cost of delivery such as academic time, the cost of professional services staff, any external room hire, materials, travel and catering/entertainment. We would expect a minimum contribution of c50%. Short-courses income and expenditure may be run through departmental reserves (9000 accounts) or reported directly in faculty accounts that are reported to Executive Deans of Faculties and KPED by Management Accountants. (Coding will change as the new Finance System goes live in 2018. In the interim refer to either KPED or Management Accounts)

26. Faculties, Divisions, and Departments shall bear any losses resulting from any short course activity previously authorised by their Executive Dean.

27. Short courses are ordinarily exempt from VAT. However, it is recommended that the advice of the Chief Accountant be sought for short courses to be run in conjunction with an external body.

28. Staff may receive personal benefit from undertaking teaching on short courses as additional salary subject to Executive Dean of Faculty approval and in line with section 9.5 of the Financial Procedures.

29. Executive Deans of Faculties and Divisions/Departments will be required to incorporate an annual account of short courses income into their Strategic and Financial Planning, including the amount of short course income brought into the Faculty or Division, the amount and percentage of Faculty/Division overhead on that income, and the amount and percentage of income disbursed to named individuals, research groups and/or departments.

30. All short course income will be coded as follows:
   - W45 – for individuals on open enrolment courses
   - W47 - for SME clients
   - W48 - for non SME clients
   - W49 - for non-commercial organisations including charities, NGOs, and NHS
Section I
Intercollegiate Policy
1. **Introduction**

University of London Colleges and Institutes share a history, ethos and commitment to standards that is similar to King’s College London. King’s recognises the unique arrangement with other member Colleges/Institutes of the University of London that provides students with the opportunity to access a wide range of teaching opportunities, facilities and services across the University of London as a whole and enhance the student experience.

This policy details the principles which apply to the approval and management of intercollegiate module arrangements.

King’s has a formal Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) with the following participating colleges:

- Birkbeck
- Goldsmiths
- Queen Mary
- Royal Holloway
- School of Oriental and African Studies
- University College London

The MoA facilitates the general sharing of intercollegiate modules on a reciprocal basis. Where a department wishes to enter into an arrangement that is not reciprocal in nature or includes specific arrangements an annex to the formal MoA will be required setting out the additional arrangements.

The College has also has individual agreements or mutual understandings in place with the following partners:

- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (MSc Global Mental Health Joint Award)
- Royal Veterinary College (BSc programmes in School of Bioscience Education)
- Royal Academy of Music (BMus and MMus programmes).

2. **Definitions**

- **Intercollegiate Module**: the term used to describe a credit bearing module offered by another Member College/Institute covered by the ordinances of the University of London.

- **Intercollegiate programme**: Students registered on a named programme at King’s or the Partner Institution are able to take optional modules or may be required to take compulsory modules from another Partner. Students are not able to complete their programme unless they have taken at least one module from the Partner. Only the home institution awards the final degree. The arrangement is expected to be reciprocal in nature. Where the programme leads to a joint/double/multiple or dual award the provisions set out in the College’s Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision will apply.

- **Module provision**: Students registered on a King’s programme are offered the opportunity to take specific modules from another Partner as part of their programme. The arrangements must be advertised to students as part of the programme in advance, but students will be advised that they will be able to complete their programme without the need to take any modules from another Partner. The
difference to intercollegiate programmes is that the arrangement does not need to be reciprocal in nature.

- **Elective module sharing:** Students registered on a King's programme can opt to take optional modules (up to the maximum number of credits permitted by the programme specification) at a Partner Institution. The arrangements are not advertised to students in advance and are subject to approval from the relevant Programme convenor. Students will be able to complete their programme regardless of whether they choose to register for a module at the Partner Institution.

3. **The following general principles apply to all intercollegiate arrangements:**

- Arrangements are only offered with another member College/Institute that is covered by the ordinances of the University of London;
- Arrangements are compliant with the College’s policy and procedures to meet the requirements of the Academic Regulations;
- The department is responsible for ensuring they are fully aware of the regulations and policies relating to academic and financial considerations in place at the Partner, and that these are made known to students;
- The Partner is declared and approved as a King’s teaching partnership by the UK Visas & Immigration Home Office for the purposes of student visas and that monitoring requirements for students can be evidenced;
- The programme specification document should include information on the intercollegiate arrangements (approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee or equivalent);
- The marks gained in modules taught and assessed by the Partner will count towards the final award;
- The modules offered must be deemed appropriate for the programme of study by the relevant programme convenor or faculty committees/officers;
- Safeguards are in place to prevent a student taking a module from a Partner that significantly overlaps with a module that a student has already taken or could potentially take at King’s for their programme of study;
- An academic rationale is specified for mapping the credit level and value of the Partners provision where this does not fit naturally with the King’s programme of study;
- The total credit volume awarded does not exceed the period of study that can be completed elsewhere in accordance with the relevant College regulations e.g. for an undergraduate degree (the maximum credit granted shall not exceed 120 credits in value);
- Resit and reassessment opportunities are made clear to students where they differ from what is offered at King’s;
- Student conduct, complaints and appeals procedures are made clear to students and are fairly applied.

---

60 This is to ensure we are compliant with the Border Agency/UKVI Tier 4 sponsorship requirements to meet the College’s statutory obligations for provision of listing sites and teaching partnerships on our Tier 4 licence and monitoring arrangements.
4. **The following principles apply to all intercollegiate programme and module provision arrangements:**

- Partnerships are established and approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee or its equivalent\(^{61}\);

- The arrangements are:
  - implemented securely and monitored by a steering committee or equivalent;
  - managed effectively through the relevant departmental and faculty committee governance structure to safeguard the student interests, including arrangements for students with special needs, equality of opportunity, health and safety;
  - equivalent to or enhance the academic standards of modules delivered by King’s, including compatibility with any relevant benchmarking information;
  - supported through quality assurance mechanisms ensuring compliance with the QAA’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education;
  - at an appropriate level to achieve the intended learning outcomes for that component of the overall programme;
  - considered by the departmental Assessment Sub-board for the validation of student marks and to confirm credit value;
  - compliant with external agency policies such as the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), the International Ombudsman Association (IOA), UK Statutory Bodies, Professional Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) or non UK Quality Assurance Agencies;

- The department
  - ensures that formal documentation is in place with the Partner setting out the operational arrangements agreed between the relevant Parties\(^{62}\) where this is not covered by the College’s formal MoA with approved Intercollegiate Partners. Where these include financial arrangements a legally-binding MoA must be in place or an annex drawn up to add financial arrangements to the existing MoA with approved Intercollegiate Partners;
  - ensures that arrangements are in place for periodic review of the agreement;
  - ensures that if the arrangement is terminated, the provisions set out in the College Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity are applied.

5. **The following principles apply to all elective module sharing arrangements:**

- Students are advised that they may be permitted to take modules from other University of London member Colleges/Institutions, subject to availability and approval from the appropriate authorities;

- Safeguards are put in place to prevent a student taking an intercollegiate module which significantly overlaps with a module already studied at King’s or which will be taken subsequently or simultaneously;

- Departments ensure that students are fully aware of the implications of undertaking study outside of King’s;

- A formal agreement is not required as arrangements for elective module sharing are agreed on an ad hoc basis or are likely to be with a Partner for which there is an intercollegiate module sharing agreement in place. However, the department should ensure that the students complete the processes for registering with Kings and the

---

\(^{61}\) The FEC should consider any existing/long-standing arrangements against the policy and confirm that they are in line with the College’s approved policy.

\(^{62}\) The College has templates in place for documenting operational arrangements for intercollegiate module arrangements. Please consult with the QAS Office for information on the template to use.
Partner for the approved module. Incoming students will be expected to complete the College’s Intercollegiate Registration Form (IRF1) for this purpose;

- Departments should ensure that they are aware of any fees\(^{63}\) being charged by the receiving institution and consult with Registry Services to ensure appropriate arrangements are in place between King’s and the Partner for the purposes of receiving or submitting invoices.

\(^{63}\) The College reserves the right to charge incoming students a pro-rata fee equivalent to the normal fee for the programme that the module in question forms part of where that institution would charge King’s in return. The department will be invoiced for any fees billed by another University of London member College/Institution for outgoing students.
Section J
Recognition of Prior Learning
Policy on the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

1. It is College policy that King’s College London recognises that knowledge and skills can be acquired from a wide range of learning experiences, both formal and informal. The College therefore encourages the recognition of prior learning (i.e. learning that has been assessed and for which credit has been awarded, often by other HEIs inside or outside of the UK) and experiential learning (i.e. learning that has taken place in the workplace as a means of providing entry to, or credit within, all of its taught programmes at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Such recognition will take place within the context of the QAA Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (FHEQ).

2. Recognition of prior learning (RPL) is a process through which previously assessed learning is considered and recognised towards a defined King’s award. Credit can be used from a previously uncompleted or completed award. Credit may only be recognised for King’s awards when it is at the higher education level (e.g. levels 7 of the FHEQ).

3. Recognition of prior experiential learning is the process of recognising learning which has, as its source, some experience which occurred prior to the point of a candidate entering her/his current programme and has been undertaken within a workplace. Experiential learning is defined in this context as knowledge and skills gained through work experiences as well as through non-formal learning, development and training activities. For example a student may have worked in an area related to their degree prior to commencing that degree, and may have acquired the learning outcomes of an individual module as a direct result of their work experience.

4. It is College policy that there is no general right of entry; the final decision rests with the admitting Faculty/Department. The admitting Faculty/Department may, in order to ensure that such students fulfil the objective of the programme of study, make admission conditional upon the undertaking of preparatory or supplementary studies, or the inclusion of particular modules in the programme to be taken by the student. Any such conditions shall be agreed by the Faculty/Department and the student before admission.

5. Regulation G7 provides further information on the criteria to be followed for recognition of prior learning.

6. It is College Policy that marks are not awarded for prior learning.

7. Recognition of prior learning: It is College policy that responsibility for the award of any credit always falls within the remit of the Assessment Sub-board. In most cases, the initial assessment of prior learning will be undertaken by the Admissions Tutor for the programme; it should be recognised that, in such cases, the Admissions Tutor is acting on behalf of the Assessment Sub-board. Admissions Tutors should report decisions formally to the Sub-board, which should record them at the next available meeting.

8. Recognition of experiential learning: It is College policy that responsibility for the award of any credit for experiential learning always falls within the remit of the Assessment Sub-board. However, discussions of this nature may need to be managed at departmental level, with academic judgement concerning the suitability of the learning key to the decision to award credit. Admissions input should be utilised where required e.g. where there may be VISA implications.
Recognition of Prior Learning Policy

Admissions process

9. Applications for consideration of RPL should normally be submitted prior to commencement of the programme.

10. Application processes for consideration of RPL should be defined in detail for individual programmes; such processes should be published in the Department’s Handbook. Details will include specific guidance on the evidence that should accompany applications, arrangements to support applicants through any application process and details of any additional fees that may be incurred.

11. Applications should be considered by the appropriate Assessment Sub-board or the Sub-board’s nominee (for example the admissions tutor).

12. Applications should detail the amount and level of credit being claimed and details of any modules that the applicant wishes to be exempted from; detail of what the applicant has achieved that merits recognition and any appropriate evidence supporting the claim. For recognition of prior learning this will normally include a transcript from the applicant’s previous institution outlining the credits and marks obtained previously as well as module outlines as appropriate; for experiential learning this may consist of a portfolio of work demonstrating how the applicant meets the learning outcomes of the module being waived.

13. Where the Assessment Sub-board, or their nominee, is satisfied that learning being claimed for is of an appropriate level, that the learning outcomes of any previous learning are equivalent to the learning outcomes of the programme that the applicant is now registering for, and that the evidence provided confirms the achievement by the applicant of these learning outcomes, then the board may confirm the award of RPL credit towards the relevant King’s award, in accordance with the regulations. The Assessment Sub-board should arrange for the student to be advised of their decision and any exemptions, and the King’s student record system should be updated to record the award of credit.

14. Marks for study at institutions other than King’s will not normally be included in decisions on classification of awards, and Assessment Sub-Boards may need to approve an alternative method to derive the classification of awards for students with RPL.

15. The support and evaluation of experiential learning is undertaken at programme level. Assessment Sub-boards, or their nominee may consider applications and either:
   • Proceed to assessment (see paragraph 17 and 18);
   • Refer the application back to the applicant, requesting further evidence;
   • Reject the application where, in the academic judgement of the board, there is no reasonable chance of the application being successful.

Evaluation of RPL

16. The evaluation of an application for RPL must centre on the demonstration by the applicant of the skills, knowledge and understanding required to progress successfully within the relevant programme. The focus is therefore on assessing the comparability of the outcomes of prior learning to those of the module or programme.
17. All learning must have been assessed in order that students can be seen to have demonstrated the achievement of the specified learning outcomes.

18. Where an application proceeds to assessment, the Assessment Sub-board (or their nominated individual) must define the method by which they will assess whether the applicant has achieved the learning outcomes being claimed for. This may be by formal examination, completion of a piece of coursework or similar, production of a portfolio of work or some other method at the discretion of the programme Assessment Sub-board. The assessment method should be devised taking the following into account:

- Recognition is given for learning, not for experience alone;
- The learning that is recognised should be transferable, and not just context-specific;
- Credit awarded as a result of recognition of prior experiential learning is of the same value as credit gained through formal learning;
- The applicant is responsible for demonstrating their prior learning.

19. The assessment method defined to confirm experiential learning by the Assessment Sub-board in paragraph 18 must be approved by an external examiner. The outcome of the assessment undertaken by the applicant must also be approved by the appropriate external examiner.

20. Where the outcome of the assessment is that the application is accepted then the College student record system should record the award of credit together with any appropriate exemptions.

21. Credit may be awarded, and exemptions applied, for specific modules or levels of individual programmes. Applicants accepted for admission with advanced standing (see regulation G7) will normally only be permitted to commence studies at the beginning of the appropriate year of the programme.

22. Credit awarded as part of the RPL process must be awarded at a specific level, and must be for a specific amount of credit. The minimum award by this process will be 15 credits.

23. Learning credited towards an award should be reasonably current; a judgement on currency will be dependent upon the subject area. The College’s Academic Regulations state that the time between registration on previous programme and award of a degree should be no more than 10 years for the previous programme’s credit to count towards the new degree. Assessment Sub-Boards (or any nominated individual acting on their behalf) should consider whether any credit previously awarded relates to the achievement of learning outcomes that would remain relevant in their subject area.

24. The consideration of credit towards a King’s award is a matter of academic judgement for the relevant Assessment Sub-boards (or any nominated individual acting on their behalf). Assessment Sub-boards have overall responsibility for defining any process by which RPL will be considered for that programme, or alternatively may consider that RPL is not appropriate for any programme within their remit.

25. For Experiential learning the following should be taken into account:

- Recognition is given for learning, not for experience alone;
- The learning that is recognised should be transferable, and not just context-specific;
• Credit awarded as a result of recognition of prior experiential learning is of the same value as credit gained through formal learning;
• The applicant is responsible for demonstrating their prior experiential learning and how that maps onto the programme they are applying for.

26. Reasons for rejection of applications for RPL may include, but are not limited to, the following:

• There is insufficient evidence to confirm that the learning claimed for is of the appropriate credit level;
• There is insufficient evidence to confirm that the learning outcomes claimed are the equivalent of relevant learning outcomes for the module or programme;
• The learning claimed for took place outside of a reasonable timescale before the end of the programme of study to which the application relates;
• The student has not been able to demonstrate achievement of appropriate learning outcomes from the learning claimed;
• RPL is not appropriate for the relevant programme of study.

The use and re-use of credit

27. Normally credit for a completed award can only be used to seek advanced standing to an award at a higher level. Credit for a complete award cannot normally be used towards another award at the same level, as this would constitute double counting of credit. Credit from a complete award can be used towards another award at the same level only if the following criteria are met:

• The award towards which the student is seeking credit is in a different subject, vocational or professional area to her/his prior award;

OR

• The award is at Master’s level and enables the student to advance her or his existing subject, professional or vocational area in a new or specialist direction

28. Where the module being waived is using learning gained from one of the College’s free-standing module(s), that has not been used as credit elsewhere within the College then the marks from that free-standing module can be used as part of the final degree calculation of the new degree programme the student is registering on.

Appeals

29. Appeals against decisions in respect of applications for RPL will only be considered where there is clear evidence of a significant administrative or regulatory error; there is no provision for appeal against the academic judgement of the Assessment Sub-board or their nominee.

30. Any appeal must be made in writing and submitted to the Student Conduct and Appeals Office within 14 days from the date of issue of the decision, citing the grounds and basis of the appeal, with evidence as appropriate.
31. Where a *prima facie* case of a significant administrative or regulatory error is established the appeal will be referred to the relevant Dean of Faculty\textsuperscript{64} (or her/his nominee) to adjudicate. The Dean, or her/his nominee, may reject the appeal or refer the application back to the Assessment Sub-board with recommendations. The decision of the Dean, or her/his nominee, shall be final.

\textsuperscript{64} In this context “Faculty” includes the Dental Institute, Dickson Poon School of Law or Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience
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Policy on closing or suspending a programme
Introduction
This policy sets out the King’s procedures for closing or suspending all taught and research programmes. Programme closure and suspension requests must be submitted on a Programme Modification Form (PMF) via the OPAMA system, following the established process for programme modifications.

The policy aligns with the QAA’s UK Quality Code for Higher Education and takes account of Competition & Markets Authority (CMA) advice. It also aligns with the King’s Student Protection Plan. The principle underpinning the policy is that in all cases the experience of students on the programme should be assured and monitored.

Programme closure/suspension is a five-stage process, unless action is taken within the admissions cycle in which case an additional stage is required (Stage 0)

1. Scope of the Policy
1.1 The policy is applicable to:
- on campus provision i.e. programmes which are delivered and supported entirely by King’s College London staff and which lead to an award from King’s College London;
- offsite delivery (including online) i.e. programmes which are delivered and supported entirely by King’s College London staff irrespective of the location of delivery and which lead to an award from King’s College London. Where the programme also exists in an on campus delivery mode and only one of the versions is closing, this should nonetheless be put through the programme closure process in order to safeguard the experience of students on that particular iteration of the programme;
- programmes delivered under a collaborative provision arrangement. Where, for a programme delivered under a collaborative provision arrangement, the intention is also to close the partnership, the collaborative provision procedures should also be followed.

1.2 The policy is not applicable to:
- the removal of programme variants (such as part-time versions of programmes). The request to remove a variant must follow the standard programme modification process.
- the removal of a pathway within an over-arching programme. The request to remove a pathway should have due regard to CMA advice and be undertaken in discussion with any other Faculties involved in the delivery or which depend on modules which will cease to run as a result of the closure. The request must follow the standard programme modification process.
- Short courses

2. Definitions
2.1 Closure A programme is closed when there are no students enrolled on the programme, including those who have interrupted. There are therefore two stages to a programme closure.

2.1.1 The programme is closed to applicants and therefore also to new entrants on to programmes.

---

65 Those programmes that have been identified to close via Portfolio Simplification process will follow a different set of processes.
66 CMA advice on consumer protection law applies to the relationship between HE providers and prospective and current students. Universities that fail to meet their obligations may be in breach of consumer protection law.
67 Only the term ‘Closure’ should be used when referring to the deletion, permanent withdrawal, discontinuing of programmes.
2.1.2 The programme is **fully** closed when all enrolled students have left the programme.

2.2 **Suspension** A programme is suspended when a decision is taken not to recruit to the programme or to deliver the programme *for a defined period*.

3. **Principles**

3.1 A Faculty’s decision to close a programme must take full account of the needs of existing students, applicants to the programme and offer holders, including deferred applicants and offer holders. It should support students through to the completion of their intended study wherever possible or put in place appropriate alternative arrangements. In either case arrangements must be made to guarantee the quality of experience for such students during the period of any teach-out. These arrangements should also ensure that the programme continues to address the requirements of any PSRB or government agency which accredits the programme.

3.2 *Before* commencing the formal procedures to close or suspend a programme, the Faculty must ensure that arrangements are in place for interrupted and deferred students so that they can complete their studies. Provisions must also be made for students who require the opportunity to re-sit or to repeat a year of their studies. Any other Faculties relying on modules from the programme in question (e.g. a joint honours programme taught across more than one Faculty) must also be consulted. In the case of a collaborative provision arrangement, the Faculty must contact QSE to take advice on the termination clauses in the memorandum of agreement prior to communicating with the partner institution, students or other stakeholders. In the case of joint programmes, all Faculties must agree to the closure before procedures commence. The external examiner(s) must also be invited to comment.

3.3 Once applicants have placed King’s as their firm choice it is not possible to close or suspend a programme unless it can be documented that all potential alternative arrangements have been exhausted. Admissions must be consulted in such cases. Where applications have been received but offers not yet made, a decision to close or suspend a programme must be made early enough in the cycle so as not to disadvantage applicants.

3.4 Where staff terms and conditions or service are affected or there are potential redundancies, Human Resources must be consulted at the earliest opportunity.

3.5 If a programme is suspended and a decision is taken at a later date to close it, a Programme Modification Form noting the revised decision should be submitted to the Faculty Education Committee (FEC) for initial approval, and then forwarded to QSE who will seek final sign-off from the Chair of the Programme Development & Approval Sub-Committee (PDASC).

3.6 All decisions to close or suspend programmes must be taken in good time, with due regard for the need to address the position of existing students and potential applicants. It should be remembered that undergraduate applicants may apply for entry to a programme up to two

---

68 If the defined period reaches it end but further suspension is required, the suspension process must be repeated.

69 For the purpose, the term ‘Faculty Education Committees’ (FECs) will be used as a catch-all term to describe the panel that approves programme modifications at Faculty, Institute or School level.
years before taking up their place. It should be noted that if a decision to close or suspend a programme is taken late in the admissions cycle, the availability of suitable alternatives at the College or at other institutions may be limited and the applicant might be able to claim financial compensation from the university, thereby causing potential reputational damage.

3.7 The programme must continue to be actively managed and subject to the university’s requirements of module evaluation, annual monitoring and external examining and must therefore retain a Programme Leader for the duration of the programme.

3.8 Ongoing monitoring must ensure that the equity of experience for students on the programme is maintained. If the programme is due for review during the teach-out phase the Faculty should contact QSE for guidance.

4. **Rationale for closure or suspension**

4.1 Programmes may be closed or suspended for a number of reasons, including, but not limited to:
- declining student applications and/or enrolments;
- key staff leaving the university/being on sabbatical;
- creation of a new programme that merges a number of existing programmes;
- changing strategic priorities at Department, Faculty or university level;
- concerns about the quality and academic standards on the programme;
- termination of a memorandum of agreement, termination for another reason of a collaborative provision arrangement which also results in the closure of a programme.

4.2 Recommending programme closure is also an option available to Programme Review Panels.

4.3 In addition, a programme which has no students enrolled in its first year, or projected to enrol, and for which there are no Firm offer holders should normally be closed. Programmes that fall into this category will be identified as part of the annual planning process. Faculties will be required to demonstrate why a programme should remain open if they disagree.

5. **Authority to make decisions about closure or suspension**

5.1 The decision is made by the relevant FEC and approved by PDASC.

6. **Stage 0: Proposal to close or suspend a programme during, or just prior to, a recruitment cycle**

6.1 Faculties, Admissions and Marketing may agree during, or just prior to, an admissions cycle that it would be desirable to close or suspend a programme. In these circumstances it may be appropriate to stop additional applicants applying to the programme. In this case, the Faculty Education Manager must send an email to the Director of Admissions & Registry Services and the Director of Brand & Marketing requesting that a temporary hold be put in place, whilst the rest of the programme closure/suspension process is followed.

6.2 Marketing will remove the programme temporarily from the Online Prospectus.

6.3 Admissions will remove the programme temporarily from the Admissions Portal (and UCAS where appropriate).

---

70 Approval of programmes closures and suspensions is delegated from the Academic Board to PDASC.
6.4 It is essential that remaining stages of the programme closure/suspension process are completed.

6.5 If the programme closure/suspension does not go ahead the Faculty Education Manager must send an email to the Director of Admissions & Registry Services and the Director of Brand & Marketing requesting that this temporary hold be removed and the actions above reversed.

7. **Stage 1: Faculty Consideration**

7.1 Stage 1 involves consideration and approval by the relevant FEC of the rationale and an assessment of the impact of the proposed closure/suspension. A PMF must be submitted to the FEC which includes the number of students enrolled on the programme and confirmation that there are not any applicants, offer holders or deferred offer holders who would be affected by the proposal. Where there are, applicants, offer holders (including deferred offer holders), and Admissions must be consulted. Students on the programme must be consulted on the proposals and any alternatives at a formative stage of deliberations. In the rare event that teach out is not possible, affected students should be offered the opportunity to transfer to suitable alternative programmes at King’s or at another institution. The Faculty should identify these alternative as part of stage 1 of the programme closure process.

**Joint Degrees**

7.2 For joint degree programmes the template should be considered by the lead Faculty’s FEC but only after discussions have taken place with the other relevant Faculties and students consulted.

**Collaborative Provision**

7.3 For collaborative provision arrangements, the Faculty must contact QSE to take advice on the termination clauses in the memorandum of agreement before communicating with the partner institution, students and other stakeholders. This is to ensure that the programme closure is conducted in accordance with the memorandum of agreement and to identify whether the agreement will need to be renegotiated, varied or terminated.

**Renewal of Suspensions**

7.4 QSE will contact the Faculty Education Manager when the requested suspension period of a programme is due to expire, to prompt the renewal of the suspension, re-introduction of the programme or permanent closure of the programme.

8. **Stage 2: Approval**

8.1 Initial approval is by the Lead Faculty’s FEC (following approval by the FECs of other relevant Faculties for joint honours taught across more than one Faculty) and can only be given if arrangements are in place to support any deferred, interrupted or repeating students.

8.2 The programme closure/suspension documentation is then forwarded via OPAMA (with Faculty approval attached) to QSE for final approval by PDASC.

8.3 PDASC approval is conditional on any Firm offer holders being agreeable to be transferred.

---

By delegation from the Academic Board
to other programmes either at King’s or elsewhere.

9. **Stage 3: Internal Communications**

9.1 Once the approval to close or suspend a programme has been processed, automated emails are generated in OPAMA to relevant staff to alert them to the decision. If a PhD programme is closed, QSE will notify the Head of Postgraduate Policy and Operations via email.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient of automated notification</th>
<th>Action to be taken upon receipt of notification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Remove programme from online prospectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Remove programme from UCAS and application portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Services</td>
<td>Update SITS, close the programme on MCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality, Standards and Enhancement</td>
<td>Update spreadsheets for PDASC reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 The Faculty’s School Quality Administrator (SQA – or equivalent) must ensure that relevant teams within the Faculty are notified, along with any other Faculties which have been involved with the delivery of the programme.

9.3 The Lead Faculty’s SQA should notify relevant PSRBs (where applicable).

9.4 For collaborative provision arrangements, QSE (for UK arrangements) and/or the Global Mobility Office (for study abroad arrangements) should be consulted to confirm the appropriate person that the Faculty must notify.

9.5 A list of programme closures and suspensions will be reported annually to PDASC.

9.6 If there are no students active on a programme, all associated SITS records can be taken out of use immediately on both CRS and MCR. If students are still active on the programme or if it is suspended, only the applicant/admissions SITS records are taken out of use on MCR.

10. **Stage 4: Applicant and Student Communications**

10.1 Where there are Firm Offer Holders, individual conversations, which must be documented, must be held between the applicant and the faculty to offer these individuals a place on other programmes at King’s or elsewhere. If this is not successful, then the programme may need to be continued and not suspended or closed. For specialist programmes reliant upon one academic, Faculties must contact QSE guidance.

10.2 Admissions will then inform any applicants that the programme is being closed or suspended and provide them with information about alternative programmes of study available (where

---

72 The ‘Proposer’ of closure/suspension, Faculty SQA, Programme Leader, Timetabling, Planning, Library Services will also receive the automated email.

73 Currently, these are MCR, IPP and IPO (applicant/admissions related records) and CRS and CBO (student related records)

74 An audit will be carried out every year by the Student Data Quality Team to check if all students have completed the programme(s) scheduled for closure, after which the programme(s) closure will be finalized
possible) through the Admissions Portal. If the applicant subsequently wishes to withdraw their application this should be permitted and any application fee, or deposit fee paid should be refunded in full. If the student has applied through UCAS, the Admissions Team must advise UCAS in order to let the applicant make a substitute choice.

10.3 Once the decision has been made to close or suspend a programme, Admissions should consult the UCAS Admissions Guide for specific information relating to UCAS applicants. They should identify any applicants who will be affected by the decision and notify them. If the applicant does not reply within the timescale requested in the initial letter, Admissions should issue a reminder letter advising the applicant that their application will be withdrawn if no response is received within a specified timescale.

10.4 For taught postgraduate programmes, in some specialist areas (e.g. teaching,), there might be additional procedures dictated by the relevant application scheme or PSRB and the Faculties concerned should ensure that they adhere to these as well as to the internal procedure.

10.5 The Faculty must inform students enrolled on the programme (and any linked programmes) and discuss the implications with them at the earliest opportunity. Students should be informed of any plans for teaching-out the programme and provided with details of how the Faculty intends to maintain the quality of the student learning experience during the teach out phase. In addition, appropriate student representatives should also be included in this process. If teaching out the programme is not possible, affected students should be offered the opportunity to transfer to suitable alternative programmes at King’s or at another institution. Care should be taken not to forget the need for arrangements for students who have suspended their studies or need to refer or those who have deferred entry.

11. Stage 5: Final Closure of programme

11.1 A yearly process will be run in SITS to determine if there are still students on the programme(s) due for closure. Once all students have completed, the programme(s) will be closed with all associated SITS records taken out of use on CRS and future CBO screens.

11.2 The Student Data Quality Team will send an email to the relevant SQA(s) to notify them that the final closure of the programme has been processed.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 These procedures provide a framework for the approval and effective management by King’s of new validation or accreditation arrangements. They comply with the Expectations, Practices and Advice and Guidance set out in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education. The procedures are intended to support working in partnership with another organisation in a manner that safeguards the College’s reputation and the quality of learning opportunities for students. This is undertaken through a set of key policy principles set out in paragraph 4 below which should be read in conjunction with the College’s Procedures for programme and module approval and modification, Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review, and the Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision.

1.2 The College has ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities and will only consider arrangements with a Partner where there is (a) a strong strategic reason for doing so, (b) where the Partner is also subject to the UK Quality Code and (c) where the Partner can demonstrate it has the infrastructure in place to safeguard and maintain King’s standards and the quality of awards.

1.3 The College is unlikely to enter into arrangements for accreditation due to the complexity of these types of arrangement and the devolved responsibility for quality assurance mechanisms where the College would only have limited control. Therefore, the procedures for accreditation have been included for advisory purposes only.

2. DEFINITION OF TERMS

2.1 The following definitions are used in this document:

Accreditation is the process whereby an institution without its own degree awarding powers is given wide authority by the College to exercise powers and responsibility for academic provision. The College will remain ultimately responsible for the quality and standard of its awards, but only exercises limited control over the quality assurance functions of the partner institution.

Validation is the process whereby the College judges that a programme of study developed and delivered by another institution or organisation is of an appropriate quality and standard to lead to a King’s award and is subject to the College’s quality assurance procedures. The College will determine the extent to which it exercises direct control over the quality assurance aspects of the programme’s management.

Partner institution describes the institution or other body with which the College enters into an agreement to collaborate. It refers both to institutions that are given powers under an accreditation arrangement and institutions that have one or more of their programmes validated by the College.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE VALIDATION AND ACCREDITATION PROCESS

3.1 The objectives of the validation and accreditation process are to establish whether ostensibly a case for validation or accreditation exists and to ensure that the key principles underpinning the arrangement can be met. This will be determined through an approval process.
process, including a validation/accreditation event and the subsequent recommendations made.

4. **KEY PRINCIPLES**

4.1 The following key principles will underpin all validation and accreditation activity at the College. The arrangement must be able to:

➢ Complement the strategic priorities set out in King’s Strategic Vision 2029 and the College Education Strategy, including whether the partner institution is of good standing and fits with the College’s ethos and values;
➢ Demonstrate that the programme(s) or academic provision offered will be delivered at the appropriate standard and level to meet the requirements for the relevant King’s award, including compatibility with any relevant benchmarking information and PSRB requirements;
➢ Establish an appropriate governance structure that can be supported through the College’s governance arrangements to ensure the necessary oversight for maintaining the academic standards of awards;
➢ Ensure that the College’s legal obligations can be fully met;
➢ Demonstrate that the partner institution has a secure medium to long term future and is financially sound;
➢ Demonstrate that the appropriate quality assurance mechanisms/regulatory frameworks are in place to guarantee the operation of the programme(s) to the required standards as determined by the College. This includes being subject to the College’s own monitoring and review processes to provide consistency of practice and quality across programmes offered internally and those validated or accredited by King’s.
➢ Demonstrate that the appropriate resources, including staffing and support services, are in place to provide a stable and suitable learning environment for students enabling them to achieve successful outcomes.

5. **STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS**

5.1 The King’s Strategic Vision 2029 is to make the world a better place and to continue to expand the significant contribution that King’s makes in London and within the UK, and beyond that to an international community that serves the world. The Education Strategy is built upon the first priority of Vision 2029 - ‘educate to inspire and improve’. King’s Strategic Vision 2029 and Education Strategy can be located at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/strategy/index.aspx

6. **ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND AWARDS**

6.1 King’s is responsible for the academic standards of validated/accredited programmes, their oversight and maintenance and for the compatibility of such standards with any relevant benchmark information and qualifications framework recognized within the UK. This responsibility rests with the Academic Board at King’s and its sub-structure and will be carried out through a number of quality assurance mechanisms such as the approval, monitoring and review of programmes, assessment boards and external examiner reports.

6.2 Awards offered by the College are set out in the Academic Regulations. Where a partner institution wishes King’s to validate or accredit an award not offered by the College this will be subject to approval from the College’s Academic Board at the outset.
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7. GOVERNANCE

7.1 The governance arrangements for partnerships operate under delegated authority from Academic Board through its sub-committee structure. Academic Board will be responsible for the formal approval of the Partner institution’s Academic Regulations.

7.2 The College Education Committee (CEC) is a sub-committee of Academic Board and will recommend approval to validate or accredit the partnership arrangement. CEC has specific responsibility for ensuring that the College’s academic provision is of the highest quality and academic standards and will enhance the student learning experience.

7.3 The Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee (CPSC) reports into CEC and brings together key representatives from all Faculties (Institutes/Schools) and key professional services staff who have knowledge of the College’s collaborative provision. CPSC is responsible for inter alia reviewing the terms of reference agreed with the Partner, and the operational arrangements set out in the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), considering the recommendations made in validation or accreditation reports and providing expert advice to CEC. CPSC is responsible for monitoring these arrangements once the partnership arrangements have commenced.

7.4 In cases where validation is requested for a programme(s) of study, the College will refer the matter to the relevant Faculty for advice to seek assurance that the objectives of the validation processes can be met. This reflects the likely subsequent operation of a validated programme whereby it becomes the responsibility of a Faculty (Institute/School) to approve, monitor and assess via the usual routes of the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent) and the relevant Assessment Boards. Therefore, proposals for validating a programme will initially be considered by the Faculty through the relevant Education Committee prior to submitting the proposal to the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee (PDASC) as would normally be the case for King’s own programmes. PDASC reports into CEC and considers for approval outline proposals for the development of programmes and final approval of complex collaborative provision activity.

7.5 Proposals from a partner institution seeking accreditation for some or all of its programmes will only be considered by CEC.

7.6 Initial validation or accreditation will normally be for a period of five years with a review scheduled at the start of the fourth academic year by the relevant Faculty Education Committee reporting into CEC for formal approval. Responsibility for managing the partnership arrangement rests with the relevant Executive Dean of Faculty and with a nominated Provost/Senior Vice-President. The Quality, Standards & Enhancement (QSE) Office will provide support to the relevant Faculty to maintain oversight of the operational arrangements for the validation or accreditation of a partner institution’s programme(s).

8. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 Legal considerations around contract agreements can be very complex. For this reason, the College undertakes due diligence enquiries through the approval processes to satisfy itself that the proposed Partner institution has the legal status to enter into an agreement with King’s. This is to protect the College’s interests and to safeguard against any potential conflicts of interest or competing priorities.

8.2 Following a successful validation/accreditation event, a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) will be put in place setting out the respective roles, responsibilities and obligations of King’s
and the partner institution, including the operational arrangements for delivering the programme activity and providing students with a high-quality experience and positive outcome. The specific details of the MoA will vary according to the nature of the partnership but an indication of the likely areas that will be covered are given at Appendix A below.

8.3 The agreement is intended to be legally-binding and will be drafted by the College and sent to the partner institution for comment and review. The terms of reference and the operational arrangements must be fully agreed between the Parties, with any issues resolved, before the programme activity can commence.

9. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

9.1 The arrangements for establishing and maintaining a validation or accreditation arrangement should be fully costed at the outset and reviewed on a periodic basis.

9.2 The financial considerations for establishing a validation or accreditation agreement should be included in the business plan. For validated provision this should be submitted as part of the programme proposal.

9.3 The financial considerations for maintaining a validation or accreditation agreement should consider the costs associated with the quality assurance of the programme or academic provision (e.g. design; approval; modification and monitoring through King’s College Committee structures and the programme review process) and those associated with supporting the student through their academic studies (e.g. student records; academic regulations and associated student policies; assessment boards; issuing of certificates and graduation ceremony). Typical operational aspects of a validation arrangement are provided at Appendix B.

9.4 The partner institution shall pay fees to the College on an annual basis. These should be agreed between the parties at the outset and included in the Memorandum of Agreement, including how any annual adjustments will be applied throughout the duration of the agreement.

9.5 Fees will be renegotiated prior to the expiry of the agreement at the same time as the programme and partner review and before a new agreement is put in place. These costs take account of any additional fees payable to cover the costs associated with re-validating the programmes or re-accrediting the academic provision through the programme and partner review, including the costs associated with drafting and finalising a new agreement.

9.6 The costings for validating or accrediting a partner institution’s provision should be undertaken by the relevant Senior Finance Business Partner and Assistant Director of Finance for the relevant Faculty (Management Accounts).

10. APPROVAL BY THE COLLEGE

10.1 The College has ultimate responsibility for the academic standards and quality of learning opportunities delivered in its name and has in place effective mechanisms for ensuring that the standards of its awards are credible and secure, and that the student experience is high quality. The approval process provides the necessary oversight to meet these expectations, including assurance that both the College and the partner institution have a shared understanding of their role, responsibilities and obligations in delivering the activity, and are able to discharge their duties effectively in this respect.
10.2 The approval process is designed to establish whether the partner institution is able to meet the key principles set out in paragraph 4 above. This is determined through an assessment of the risks attached to the proposal and a due diligence process consisting of three stages as follows:

- Stage One (Approval in principle)
- Stage Two: (Detailed scrutiny)
- Stage Three: (Final approval)

10.3 Prior to any committee consideration, informal discussions should be held with the relevant Provost/ Senior Vice-President and the Vice President/ Vice-Principal (Education).

10.4 The approval process and detailed information on each of these stages is provided in section 11 below.
## 11. APPROVAL PROCESSES

### STAGE ONE: Approval in principle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Dean of Faculty consults with the relevant Provost/Senior Vice President and Vice President/Vice Principal (Education)</th>
<th>Faculty Education/Quality Assurance team organise a meeting with the Partner to include representatives from QSE, marketing and finance</th>
<th>Partner provides a personal statement and, if applicable PPF for validated provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal approved by CEC or PDASC: proceed to stage two</td>
<td>Convene Employability workshop and update documentation</td>
<td>Proposal rejected by CEC or PDASC: QSE will contact Partner to advise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal rejected by CEC or PDASC: QSE will contact Partner to advise</td>
<td>Submit full documentation to CEC or PDASC for approval in principle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAGE TWO: detailed scrutiny

| QSE contacts the Partner Institution and Senior College staff to organise a validation or accreditation event. *(Faculty prepares first draft of MoA with Partner)* | Partner submits information requested to QSE six weeks prior to the date of the validation or accreditation event with support provided by the Faculty team | Validation or Accreditation Event held at Partner Institution and outcome determined. A written report will be produced following the event |

### STAGE THREE: final approval

| PAF and/or draft agreement considered and approved by Faculty Education Committee or equivalent referencing recommendations in validation event report | Validation or Accreditation Event Report circulated to CPSC for comment Academic Regulations submitted to ASSC PAF (validated provision only) submitted to PDASC for approval |
|---|---|---|
| Validation or Accreditation Event Report circulated to CPSC for comment Academic Regulations submitted to ASSC PAF (validated provision only) submitted to PDASC for approval | Recommendations from CPSC, ASSC and PDASC reported to CEC for final approval |
| Recommendations from CPSC, ASSC and PDASC reported to CEC for final approval | CEC recommends final approval to Academic Board |
| Final MoA signed following Academic Board approval and any conditions met by the Partner. | Recommended final approval to Academic Board |
| Arrangement entered onto the College’s register of collaborative partners. | Final MoA signed following Academic Board approval and any conditions met by the Partner. |
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Stage One (Approval in principle)

11.1 Requests for validation normally come from the proposed Partner institution. Prior to committee consideration, informal discussions should be held with the relevant Provost/Senior Vice President and the Vice President/Vice Principal (Education). Requests for Accreditation will only be considered by the College Education Committee (CEC). The proposer should complete the Ethical and Reputational Risk Review (ERRR) form and the Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool (CARAT) and submit these to the Collaborative Provision Sub-Committee (CPSC) to determine the level of ethical and reputational risk review attached to the proposal and whether this should be escalated to the Ethical Risk Management Committee (ERMC). Consideration of the Partner approval are also incorporated into the stages of the approval process detailed below.

11.2 As part of the initial consultation process, a meeting should be organised by the Faculty Education/Quality team with the Partner to discuss the process and the level of commitment provided by King’s to oversee the partnership arrangements together with expected financial costings. The meeting should include representation from QSE and the Finance Directorate. The Faculty team should also consult with Brand and Marketing over the publicity for the programme and the use of the King’s brand by the Partner.

11.3 The purpose of the meeting is to (a) make an initial assessment of the viability of the partnership proposed and the likelihood of successful approval via the College’s governance structure; (b) provide support and guidance to the partner institution on the approval processes, including, where appropriate, the completion of PAFs and MAFs; (c) provide information on the College’s own Academic Regulations, policies and procedures and relevant templates for student handbooks, marking schemes etc.

11.4 A personal statement covering the following:
   i. Information on the Partner’s assets, including estates, facilities, funding and any third-party rights in this respect that may impact on King’s as the validating body or on the delivery of the proposed programme;
   ii. Public information on the standing of the Partner and the proposed programme, including details of any legal or government proceedings or inquiries that have taken place, are current, pending or threatened against the partner or the proposed programme;
   iii. Information on the Partner’s collaborative partnership arrangements that may impact on King’s as the validating body or on the delivery of the proposed programme;
   iv. Information on the proposed programme (for validated provision the College’s PPF template form should be completed) as follows:
      • Introduction on why the Partner is seeking validation or accreditation from King’s, their experience of operating in the relevant field and why they believe that King’s would be a good fit for their organisation;
      • Current and future plans;
      • Brief outline of their governance structure;
      • Approach to quality assurance and expected timeline for registering with the Office for students, recruiting students and start date of first cohort;
      • Brief outline of the programme rationale, curriculum and assessment structures, relevant benchmark statements and, if appropriate, PSRB accreditation;
      • Careers and Employability;
      • Marketing report;
      • Financial business case;
      • Brief outline of resources
11.5 The statement and, if appropriate, the PPF should be submitted to the Faculty Education Committee or equivalent for consideration. The Faculty will decide whether to approve the request, request further information from the Partner or reject the request.

11.6 If the Faculty Education Committee or equivalent approves the request then they will organise an Employability Workshop between King’s Careers and Employability, the Partner and the Faculty. The PPF should then be updated by the Partner to reflect the outcome of these discussions.

11.7 The final PPF should be returned to the Faculty who will seek endorsement from the relevant Provost/Senior Vice President before submitting the final documentation to PDASC for further consideration and approval to proceed to the next stage of the process.

11.8 At the end of stage one of the process the College should be able to determine that the partner institution is (a) of good standing and a fit with the College’s ethos and values; (b) confirm that the partner institution has a secure medium to long term future and is financially sound; (c) likely to deliver the programme and meet the expectations of students to the quality and standards required.

Stage Two (Detailed scrutiny)

11.9 If PDASC and/or CEC approves the request for validation or accreditation a validation/accreditation event with the potential partner institution will then take place. QSE will liaise with the Partner and relevant College staff to agree a date and timescale for the event.

11.10 The validation/accreditation event offers the opportunity for staff and students from King’s and our external advisors to meet with the Partner’s programme team and senior management to discuss the process of programme design and related academic and quality assurance requirements. The aim is to undertake a detailed examination testing the academic rigour of the proposal, enabling King’s to feel assured that the appropriate mechanisms are in place to support the students and the delivery of the arrangement. This is to ensure that the Partner and programme can deliver successful outcomes for participating students and maintain the quality and academic standards of King’s awards.

11.11 Approximately six weeks before the agreed date of the event the potential Partner Institution should forward to the QSE Office 10 copies of the validation/accreditation documentation. The exact format of the submission is a matter for the potential partner institution who may make use of existing documentation submitted for other purposes e.g. registration with the Office for Students (OfS), PSRB accreditation.

11.12 Information required from the partner institution to be submitted should include the following:

Background information
- Statement about the history and mission of the partner institution in delivering education, including an indication of the positioning of the programme or academic provision within the local and national context
- Mapping document against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education

Admissions
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- Recruitment, selection and admissions policies and procedures, including how these will be monitored and reviewed
- entry criteria, including any subject specific requirements
- fees, other costs and financial support
- statement on approach to student access and participation, including equal opportunities monitoring

Programme content and organisation
- aims and objectives of the programme(s)
- outline curriculum structure
- syllabus for each year of the programme(s) broken down by module or unit if appropriate
- contact hours per year broken down by type e.g. lectures, seminars, practical work
- teaching and learning philosophy and methods
- opportunities for embedding employability within the programme
- If applicable, arrangements for placements, internships or study abroad, to include briefing, monitoring and de-briefing
- management arrangements for the programme(s)
- programme specification and regulations

Assessment
- rationale for the assessment methodology and how it allows achievement of the programme’s objectives, including opportunities for recognition of prior learning
- assessment and feedback practices, including how student’s progress will be monitored and feedback provided
- details of assessment methods both formative and summative
- details of marking schemes
- terms of reference, constitution and mode of operation of examination boards

Information given to students
- statement on how consumer law conditions will be met
- examples of student handbooks

Student welfare
- personal tutor system
- health and welfare facilities and advice available for students
- careers advice available for students
- procedures for student complaints, appeals and conduct
- student protection plan

Management and governance arrangements
- details of the committee structure of the institution together with terms of reference, constitution and mode of operation of committees concerned with the programme(s) and/or teaching in general
- arrangements for students to provide feedback
- arrangements for reviewing the programme(s) both annually and periodically
- use of externality in the design, delivery, assessment methods and review of the programme(s)
- use made of management information e.g. progression, withdrawal and success rates
- details of first destination returns
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Staff
- list of academic, technical and administrative staff involved with the programme(s)
- brief CVs of academic staff to include qualifications, current position and teaching responsibilities, previous teaching and other relevant experience, research, consultancy and other scholarly activity relevant to the programme(s), with dates
- policy on and details of staff development, training and welfare

Resources
- description of IT, library, teaching facilities and any other learning resources appropriate to the programme(s)
- description of how the provision of learning resources is related to the needs of the curriculum and provides a suitable learning environment for students

Validated provision only
Information relating to the programme structure and assessment can be provided by completing the College’s online templates for a Programme Approval Form (PAF) and Module Approval Form (MAF). This should be undertaken in liaison with the relevant Faculty Education team.

11.13 The format of the Validation/Accreditation event will be conducted by a panel who will visit the partner institution and provide feedback on the feasibility of the arrangement:

Panel membership
The composition of the panel will normally be as follows:
(i) the President & Principal or nominee, who will Chair the panel
(ii) the Senior Vice President (Operations) or nominee
(iii) the Chair of the College Education Committee
(iv) a Chair of a Faculty (Institute/School) Education Committee or equivalent
(v) External Peer Reviewer and where appropriate an External Peer Specialist
(vi) Student Representative
(v) in the case of a validation event, the Executive Dean of the relevant Faculty or Chair of that Faculty Education Committee or equivalent

Administrative support for the event will be provided by Quality, Standards and Enhancement in liaison with the relevant Faculty Quality Assurance Manager or equivalent.

11.14 The responsibilities of the panel are to:
- Explore teaching and learning strategies relevant to the discipline and ensure that these are appropriate for the structure and content of the programme proposed by the partner institution, and align to King’s education strategy;
- Assess whether the proposed programme is well designed and able to provide a high quality student experience to meet King’s expectations for the quality and academic standards of awards in line with national quality assurance frameworks and sector-recognised standards;
- Confirm that the content of the programme is appropriate to the subject and the qualification concerned, including compatibility with the relevant benchmark statements;
➢ Confirm that students will be provided with the learning aims and outcomes for the programme and that these are achievable and appropriate to the type and level of award;

➢ Confirm that assessment methods are appropriate to meet the objectives for the type and level of award offered;

➢ Confirm that the appropriate resources are in place to deliver the programme and provide the necessary support to students, enabling them to demonstrate their achievement and success;

➢ Confirm that staffing arrangements are adequate to deliver the programme, including whether there is a wider infrastructure in place to support staff training and development;

➢ Confirm that appropriate mechanisms are in place to allow students to engage fully in the quality of their student experience;

➢ Confirm that regulations, policies and procedures comparable to those operated by King’s are in place to deliver the programme and ensure fair access, equality of learning and the protection of students;

➢ Confirm that the information provided to students and the public about the programme is accurate and transparent.

11.15 The panel will have received the validation/accreditation documentation six weeks in advance of the event but may request additional information or clarification of issues from the potential partner institution in advance of the event.

11.16 The event will be conducted at the partner institution seeking accreditation or validation. Discussions are expected to be conducted in the spirit of a critical friend with an emphasis on how the Partner will meet the academic standards and quality of a King’s award and deliver positive outcomes for students. The discussions with the Partner also offer the opportunity to share best practice and support the development of the partnership.

11.17 The timetable will be agreed in advance between the College and the potential Partner institution and is likely to follow the model described below, although the length of sessions will vary depending on the number of programmes to be considered and the nature of the event i.e. validation or accreditation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>preliminary meeting of panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>meeting with programme team(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>lunchtime meeting with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>tour of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>meeting with student support staff e.g. IT, library, advice, admissions and registry services, personal tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>meeting with senior managers of the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>private meeting of panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>feedback to institution on outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.18 Following discussions, the Chair of the panel will report the outcome and any conditions, recommendations and/or commendations to the partner institution. The panel will recommend one of the following outcomes:

➢ Approval with no conditions attached for an initial period of five years. Proposal directly proceeds to Stage Three;

➢ Approval subject to confirmation that any conditions or requirements have been met by
the Partner within agreed timescales. The partner institution will be required to meet any conditions prior to the proposal proceeding to Stage Three;

➢ Non approval. The proposal will not proceed any further at this stage and the College will provide the partner institution with the reasons for its decision and suggestions for a way forward. This does not imply that a re-submission of the proposal would necessarily lead to validation or accreditation.

11.19 A written report of the proceedings will be produced, normally within three weeks of the event. A copy of the draft report will be forwarded to the potential partner institution for comments on issues of factual accuracy.

11.20 The drafting of the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) setting out the terms of reference, roles, responsibilities and obligations of the partner institution and King’s for the operational arrangements should be commenced alongside the panel event.

**Stage Three (Final approval)**

11.21 For validated provision, the PAF and relevant MAF(s) should be considered for approval by the Faculty Education Committee or equivalent, taking into account any recommendations or feedback from the panel event. The final PAF should be submitted to PDASC for final approval reporting into CEC.

11.22 The draft validation agreement together with the final version of the report will be submitted to CPSC for review and comment reporting into CEC. This is to ensure that the operational arrangements relating to the partnership and programme have been covered in the agreement.

11.23 The Academic Regulations governing the accredited or validated programme(s) should initially be reviewed by the Faculty Assessment Board and submitted to the College Assessment and Standards Committee for further review. The final version of the Academic Regulations should be considered for approval by CEC.

11.24 CEC will make a final recommendation for approval of the validated provision or accreditation and the Academic Regulations covering the accredited or validated programme to Academic Board.

11.25 Following final approval, College officers will liaise with the partner institution to finalise the MoA. If there are disagreements between the College and the partner institution over any aspects of the MoA it may be necessary to convene a meeting of the validation/accreditation panel and the partner institution to resolve such issues.

11.26 The partner institution will not be permitted to advertise a programme or academic provision to students as being accredited or validated by the College unless the College has given final approval and has received confirmation that the partner institution has successfully registered with the Office for Students (OfS).

11.27 Final approval is complete once the final MoA is in place having been signed by all relevant Parties and the College’s register of collaborative partners has been updated to reflect the partnership activity. For King’s the authorised signatory will be the President & Principal or nominee.
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Appendix A

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

All collaborative arrangements must be covered by a Memorandum of Agreement, signed by the relevant authorities. The purposes of the Agreement are to:

(i) establish legally-binding terms of reference between the Parties;
(ii) define the means by which the quality and academic standards of the programme will be maintained and the quality of the student experience;
(iii) ensure that the nature of the collaborative arrangement is clearly set out, will operate smoothly, and that channels of authority and accountability are clearly identified.

The specific details will vary according to the nature of the collaboration, but the following gives an indication of the areas that will be covered.

1. Background to the arrangement.
2. Definitions used within the context of the agreement.
3. Description of Validated or Accredited provision.
4. Period of Programme validation or accreditation.
5. Regulatory framework under which the validated or accredited programmes will operate.
6. Management and governance arrangements;
7. Staffing arrangements;
8. The respective roles, responsibilities and obligations of the College and the partner institution in respect of the oversight and maintenance of the academic standards of awards and quality assurance for delivering the programme(s), including approval, monitoring and management mechanisms.
9. Responsibilities for the recruitment and selection of students;
10. Responsibilities for the enrolment and registration of students, maintenance of student records and provision of information and support, including reporting to external agencies.
11. Responsibilities relating to student discipline, complaints and appeals. As the College is not permitted to delegate responsibility for the academic standards of its awards, ultimate responsibility for academic appeals and complaints about academic standards will be retained by the College.
12. Assessment and examination arrangements to include the appointment and role of external examiners.
13. Responsibilities for the conferment of awards, including the issue and secure control of award certificates.
15. Financial and statistical arrangements.
16. Publicity and promotional material arrangements, including use of King’s branding.
17. Staff arrangements.
18. Operating arrangements, including reporting and communication requirements for the provision of regular and sufficient information to enable the College to be confident that the responsibilities of the partner institution are being met. Feedback mechanisms between the
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College and partner institution.


20. **Duration and termination of the agreement, including provisions for review, and procedures for enabling either Party to withdraw from or suspend the agreement if the other Party fails to fulfil its obligations.**

21. **Consequences of termination of the agreement in respect of obligations to students.**

22. **Dispute resolution mechanism.**

23. **Other legal considerations, including those that pertain to the entire agreement; confidentiality; GDPR; governing law and jurisdiction; exclusion of contracts; third party rights; indemnity and insurance; assignment; Force Majeure; notices, waivers and variation to the agreement.**
Appendix B

Typical timeline for operational arrangements in monitoring and managing activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes to partnership arrangements including approval of new programmes, modifications to existing provision considered by Faculty Education Committee and where appropriate PDASC</td>
<td>held six times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing of programmes</td>
<td>Agreed annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of student records including change to student status</td>
<td>Created annually and updated as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of course materials and handbooks including advice from Faculty on changes at the College that may impact the Partner</td>
<td>Reviewed annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Boards to consider results, possible student appeals, academic regulations and external examiner reports</td>
<td>Held in each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing of student degree certificates</td>
<td>Undertaken annually following relevant Assessment Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Ceremonies</td>
<td>Held in January and July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of academic regulations by Academic Standards Sub Committee and approval by Academic Board</td>
<td>Held annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Monitoring meeting</td>
<td>Held annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme review and/or review of the partnership arrangements</td>
<td>Held 12 months prior to the expiry of the MoA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section M
Notes of guidance
Guidance on risk and ethics assessment in the design of modules

1. **Introduction**
1.1 This guidance is produced jointly by the College Research Ethics Committee (CREC) and the College Education Committee (CEC).

2. **Definition of taught module component**
2.1 A taught module component in this context is any type of activity which involves some kind of physical procedure or administering of questionnaires, conducting and/or taking part in interviews and making video or audio recordings for educational use. Taught module components are usually routine components of undergraduate and taught postgraduate modules which students undertake as part of their programme of study. The procedure applies to activities where the subjects are humans. It should be noted that:

- the scope of this procedure *does* apply to activities conducted in a clinical setting primarily for the purpose of gathering data for the purposes of an assignment (e.g., taping a clinical consultation for subsequent analysis) where the data is derived from other people, including non-participant observation;
- the scope of this procedure *does* apply to activities undertaken off campus for the purposes of gathering information, including non-participant observation;
- the scope of this procedure *does not* encompass clinical training in a clinical environment (including clinical practice on home visits as part of a placement) where frameworks derived from professional bodies apply and practice is supervised by competent practitioners;
- the scope of this procedure *does not* apply to work placements where other arrangements for risk assessment apply.

2.2 A list of activities which would fall under the definition of a taught module component is given below. This list covers the most commonly occurring activities. It is possible that there are some activities not included in this list which might fall within the scope of a taught module:

- videotaping classroom activities for later analysis (where individuals are recorded)
- taking samples such as blood, urine and saliva
- administering products such as food, alcohol or a medicinal product
- taking measurements of heart rate, blood pressure etc
- testing reaction times
- studying the effects of exercise
- examining perception and responses to external stimuli such as sound, temperature changes
- the effects of altering the composition of inhaled gases
- the effects of acceleration and deceleration on the body
- the use of equipment such as ultrasound, breathing devices, mobility aids
- taking non-invasive bodily samples, e.g., fingerprints
- interviewing and taking histories of patients
- designing and administering questionnaires to fellow students and/or health volunteers
- performing intimate examinations on paid volunteers
- observation studies
- food intake diaries
- interviewing (including taking a diet history)
- questionnaires
- focus groups
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There are occasions when taught module components can have an impact on the environment or society without directly involving human participants; in such cases applicants are encouraged to raise these issues with the appropriate panel/committee to ascertain whether approval will be required.

3. General principles

3.1 The general principles are as follows:

(a) The trigger point for consideration of components is the module approval process.
(b) It is not necessary or appropriate for the CREC (or a subsidiary body) to scrutinise all taught module components.
(c) The degree of scrutiny and consideration given should be proportionate to the ethical issues raised and the level of risk foreseen.
(d) The scrutiny procedures operate in tandem with health and safety risk assessment.
(e) Review of taught module components falling under this procedure operate in tandem with broad codes of conduct and good practice guidelines including an ethical framework for students relating to informed consent (by students and others participating in the activity), confidentiality, health and safety, action to take if things go wrong and student conduct (including requirements for students to adhere to approved protocols). These should be embedded within programmes of study.

3.2 Review procedures are expected to build upon existing structures for the ethical review of research. This guidance recognises that it is difficult to determine the boundaries between “research” and the types of activities covered herein and is produced in recognition of the ethical issues (and particularly risks to the individual) arising out of particular teaching activities (even when they are not deemed to be research).

4. When is approval required?

4.1 Any component associated with a particular module should be identified on the relevant module approval documentation and a preliminary checklist completed to identify the appropriate level of scrutiny. Scrutiny of the component is dependent upon the risk involved in the activity and way in which it is deployed in the module. For example, the level of scrutiny required for students practising interviews within a classroom will be different to that needed for students using self-designed interviews as part of a research project of their own.

4.2 Taught module components will fall broadly into one of three types:

(a) Activities which are conducted within a class (or equivalent) for the purposes of practising a skill or procedure or for demonstration purposes (taught module activity).
(b) Activities that involve all students on a module in the collection of fixed and pre-specified information for subsequent analysis by students which does not vary between students or from year to year (taught module assignment).
(c) Activities in which students undertake the collection of information for projects which may be developed by the student or a staff member (taught module project).

4.3 Scrutiny and approval will be at one of two levels:

Within the context of a particular module activity or assignment may then be carried out within the module. These activities will

---

1 The Taught Course Practical Checklist should be completed
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require approval using the taught module procedure.

For a specific occurrence/project approval. These activities require individual approval which cannot therefore be sought at the point of module approval. The relevant submission procedure for research applications should be followed when this is the case.

4.4 The following guidance has been produced to assist taught module leaders in ascertaining when a project would not be considered to be research:

- when the students are practicing a skill rather than generating new knowledge;
- where the ability to test the methodology being taught is what is being tested;
- where the topics to be covered are prescribed;
- when every student is doing the same thing;
- when the purpose of the activity is to confirm previous knowledge rather than to generate new knowledge.

The stated learning outcomes of the taught module should be consulted to assist with this.

5. Levels of risk presented

5.1 The activities encompassed in the taught component procedure can be categorised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low risk: Non-invasive, non-intimate examination/procedure questioning (including taking of biological samples) conducted by students on each other or on paid subjects or volunteers where all parties are aware of their participation. Examples: Blood pressure measurement, auscultation, interviews (depending upon topic), observation (depending on topic and method of observation), questionnaires (depending upon topic), ingestion of food, fingerprints, external swabs or swabs from oral mucosa, physical assistance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Potentially risky: Invasive/intimate examination/procedure/questioning (including taking of biological samples) conducted by students on each other or on paid subjects or volunteers where all parties are aware of their participation or covert observation. Examples: Taking blood, vaginal examination, ingestion of licensed medicinal product, interviews (depending upon topic), questionnaires (depending upon topic). |

5.2 The Taught Course Practice Checklist has screening questions (to assess the level of scrutiny required).

6. Approval mechanism/location

6.1 Completion of the Taught Course Practical Checklist will determine the approval mechanism to follow i.e. either FEC or submit to Research Ethics team.

7. Evaluation and monitoring

7.1 Evaluation of the practice, consistency and standards of review will be undertaken by the CREC using the same mechanisms as those for evaluating the review of research activities.
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Guidance on Global Connectedness

This document comprises proposed guidance on the global connectedness curriculum characteristic, for inclusion in the Quality Assurance (QA) Handbook. The document was written by a global connectedness steering group, comprising representatives from the Modern Languages Centre, the Study Abroad and Internships office, the Department of Education and Professional Studies, and King’s Academy.

1. Introduction.

This guidance explains specifically how global connectedness can be integrated into both the design of programmes and modules, and into programme and module approval and modification. The aim is to ensure that global connectedness is an embedded aspect of learning and teaching activity at King’s.

Global connectedness, as defined by *The King’s-Warwick Project: creating a 21st Century Curriculum* (KWP), includes the following key elements:

- The experience of students studying abroad, both UK students going overseas and international students studying in the UK. Studying abroad can include experiential learning, such as an internship.
- Students based in their own countries becoming familiar with and experiencing other cultures, languages and nationalities.
- The international aspects of all curricular and co-curricular activities.
- The learning of foreign languages.
- Awareness of UK culture and its relationships and interactions with other cultures.

Global connectedness thus includes (but is not limited to) UK students experiencing other cultural perspectives and attaining intercultural competencies in their studies, irrespective of whether the programme contains a study abroad and/or a foreign language element.

2. General Principles.

Global connectedness should be considered at both the institutional and department level, embracing diversity within the formal curriculum, the co-curriculum, and across the staff and student bodies.

The College report ‘Creating a 21st Century Curriculum: The King’s-Warwick Project,’ adopted by Academic Board, recommended that the student experience should be internationalised, for both home and overseas students. Students should be appreciative of the interconnectedness of the world and be able to recognise global perspectives.

Students who possess and develop a global connectedness perspective are likely to have enhanced openness and flexibility, and are more likely to be able to build effective relationships by communicating across cultures, enabling enhanced personal growth. Such skills are valuable in a global employment market. In addition, while it may not be practical for all students to have the opportunity to study overseas, programme teams should consider other ways in which global
perspectives might be gained, with an emphasis on activities that build intercultural competence. Such activities might include international case studies, enabling exploration of the deterministic effect of cultural contexts, and engagement with non-Western cultural norms. Less explicit practices might also be considered, such as ensuring module and programme reading lists take advantage of a readily available, global community of scholarship.

3. A structured approach is recommended for designing and reviewing programmes and modules. It is recommended that the key elements in point 1 are reviewed, assessing the extent to which these elements are:

   o already included in the programme or module;
   o able to be included, with specific changes identified;
   o not able to be included, with suggestions for alternative ways in which they can be addressed elsewhere.

The following are also recommended as part of the design and review process:

   o Consider the extent to which the learning outcomes are desirable in relation to global connectedness.
   o Review the actual or proposed teaching methods, and consider whether the desired outcomes are likely to be met by those methods, or whether they need to be brought into closer alignment. For example, where the programme or module seeks a change in attitudes, it may be appropriate to include an experiential component where possible, rather than to rely on lectures. Some examples of teaching methods can be found in section 2 above.
   o Review the approach to assessment, to consider whether students have the opportunity to demonstrate that they have met the identified learning outcomes.
   o Review the way in which student feedback is gained, to judge whether students have had sufficient opportunity to comment on their experience of global connectedness within the programme or module.
   o Review whether this aspect of the programme or module is sufficiently represented in student handbooks and other information sources.

Students should have the opportunity to provide feedback on the extent to which they have had opportunities for global connectedness during their studies. These feedback opportunities should be provided both during and after their course of study. Faculty Education Committees should monitor the extent to which opportunities for global connectedness feature within their provision.

5. Sources of support/Additional Information.
 Creating a 21st Century Curriculum: The King’s Warwick Project.

The King’s Warwick project: Creating a 21st Century Curriculum,
Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms

Programme specifications for current programmes are available at https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/specs/index. Please note that the following information may not be in the order of the online system. This is due to how the information is transferred to the SITS systems (the online form is available at https://mykcl.kcl.ac.uk/). Once inputted and approved, SITS will be automatically updated with the details of the programme.

To ensure all students have an excellent learning experience and to meet its legal obligations under the Equality Act 2010, the university must ensure that when modules and programmes are designed, they do not include features that might disadvantage students with a particular protected characteristic¹ and that they reflect and advance the learning and access needs of a diverse range of students. This should not equate to the lowering of academic standards. Instead it should allow an area of knowledge or expertise to be conveyed as effectively as possible, in order to assist a diverse range of students to attain agreed academic standards.

Where possible inclusive practice should be built in at the point of delivery, so that all students can benefit, rather than at the point of need, although where a new practice is introduced for one student because of their specific needs and is simple to implement, it will often be desirable to extend it more widely.

Where appropriate, guidance on good inclusive practice has been inserted at relevant stages so that it can be considered with respect to programme design at the relevant stage of completing the form.

Completion of programme specifications and module specifications should ideally be completed prior to the Employability-led Workshop. At the time of putting in the proposal conversations should be held with Careers and Employability to arrange a date for the workshop.

Programme approval form (the template form is available via the online system: OPAMA: https://mykcl.kcl.ac.uk/)

The programme specification
This section of the documentation contains the programme specification. The requirement upon institutions to produce programme specifications arose from the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (the Dearing Report). The QAA initially produced Guidelines for preparing programme specifications (July 2006) which described in more detail the nature and purpose of the programme specification. In October 2013, further revised November 2018, these guidance notes were updated with the introduction of the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education (https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/qualifications-and-credit-frameworks). The Guidelines describe the programme specification as “a concise description of the intended learning outcomes of an HE programme, and the means by which the outcomes are achieved and demonstrated.”

Programme specifications are required for each programme of study, but in cases where there are particular pathways² within a generic programme or where there are nested qualifications with

---

¹ The nine protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010 include: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation

² Definition of a pathway: an overarching programme that has defined modules and learning aims and outcomes, with optional modules (which may be core/compulsory to that pathway) forming a pathway. Students enrol directly onto the overarching programme, determining at some defined point during the programme of study the pathway they wish to follow². A student can’t start on a programme and exit with either a BA or a BSc (i.e. it can’t be an either/or option depending on pathways). The final award title will reflect the overarching programme and pathway undertaken, unless a professional programme of study...
Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms different exit points, then it is possible to produce one specification which can illustrate the variety of options. So, for example, a MSc in Business Studies and a PgDip in Business Studies could be shown on one specification with the PgDip as a nested award within the overall degree. Where programme specifications are produced for pathways or nested awards, the statements of programme outcomes should be made clear for each of the awards. Additionally, in cases where there are exit awards, the statement outcomes should make clear the expected outcomes for each of the available awards. Where those outcomes follow the agreed standard learning outcomes, the following statement should be noted “the following learning outcomes are applicable to all awards”.

The intended audience for a programme specification is primarily the student and therefore this should be reflected in the language used in describing the aims and objectives of the programme. The programme specification should provide a general overview of the programme, specific details of the components of a programme should be given in module specifications.

### P1.1 Programme title and designation

An undergraduate degree programme should be designated as either single honours, joint honours or major/minor. If the programme specification is being written for a generic programme with a number of pathways then the title of all the pathways should be listed.

### P1.2 Final award

The final award is one of the following and should be entered in the “Award” box in the format given below, for example Graduate Diploma, MSc:

**Undergraduate level awards**

- level 4 Undergraduate Certificate (UGCert)
- level 5 Undergraduate Diploma (DipHE), Foundation Degree (FdA), (FdSc)
- level 6 BA(Hons), BSc(Hons), BEng, BSc(Eng), BMus, LLB, Professional Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE Professional), Graduate Certificate (GradCert), Graduate Diploma (GradDip)

**Postgraduate level awards**

- level 7 Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert), Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip), BDS, MB BS, MEng, MSci, MPharm, Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE), MA, MBA, LLM, MClinDent, MSc, MMus, MPH, MRes, MTL
- Level 8 Professional doctorates – DClinPsy, EdD, DHC, DThM, DrPS

The title of the programme should then be entered in the “Title” box.

All taught programmes should be allocated an overall credit value and an ECTS equivalent. For most programmes this will accord with the standard UK tariffs and the College’s credit framework where 1 credit equals 10 hours of notional learning (which includes teaching, private study, revision and assessment) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Type</th>
<th>UK credit</th>
<th>ECTS credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate certificate</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate diploma</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation degree (2 years)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours degree (3 years)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated masters</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

requires something different. For those programmes that have an extended year of study this becomes a new programme, not a pathway. The programme specification should include a learning aim and outcome related to that additional year of study. Pathways on PGT programmes should be made up of between 90 and 120 credits from taught modules that are designated as part of the pathway and should include the dissertation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Type</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate certificate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate diploma</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate certificate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate diploma</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (2 years full-time)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible for programmes at the same level to require differing amounts of credit (e.g., 4 and 5 year honours level degrees require more than 360 credits), but programmes may not fall below the minimum amount of credit designated for the award. For further information see the table in the Academic Regulations, T4: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/campuslife/acservices/academic-regulations/assets-19-20/t04.pdf

It is important to note that the notional hours of learning in UK credit systems is a proxy measure of the volume of the learner effort required by the average learner at that time to achieve the required learning outcomes of the programme. It is difficult to state rigidly the time it takes any individual student to learn, therefore it is important to emphasise that the learning 'time' is regarded as a broad estimate. In this way notional hours of learning must, only, be employed as a rough guide. This is particularly relevant when equating UK credit to ECTS credits.

The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) aims to make study programmes in Europe easier to read and compare. The Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education includes typical credit allocations for each cycle:

- 1st cycle qualifications (equivalent to UK H level): typically include 180-240 ECTS credits
- 2nd cycle qualifications (equivalent to UK M level): typically include 90-120 ECTS credits, with a minimum of 60 credits at the level of the 2nd cycle

In Europe the workload of a full-time student during one academic year is calculated to be 60 ECTS credits. Therefore, a calculation of 1 ECTS credit = 2 UK credits at programme level provides an easy translation so that a standard BA/BSc is worth 180 and a standard MA/MSc is worth 90 ECTS credits.

For further information on the relationship between UK and ECTS credits see the following:

UUK International Unit

ECTS Users Guide

QAA general guidance on the use of credit
http://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/academic-credit-higher-education-in-england-an-introduction.pdf?sfvrsn=a3b3f981_14

P1.3 Nested awards

A nested award is a lower volume award which shares some of the learning outcomes of a larger volume award. For example a Masters degree may have a nested postgraduate diploma and/or postgraduate certificate within it which would allow participants to exit after completing the PGDip/PGCert or continue to take further modules to lead to the
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award of the MA (same level of study, lower volume of credit), and a MSci degree may have a BSc nested within it (lower level, lower volume).

In all such cases nested awards are regarded as separate programmes onto which students can be directly recruited. Students register for nested awards (unlike exit awards) and may progress from a nested award on to the ‘higher’ award (but do not then receive both awards).

Nested awards onto which students can be directly recruited will be set up as separate programmes on SITS, whereas exit awards will not (see P1.4 below).

Only a single programme specification is required for the highest level of award, for example Master’s. Indication should then be given in the “any specific criteria” box and box 18 of the nested points for the programme, for example Postgraduate Diploma, and the components of the curriculum required to be passed to achieve that particular award. Statement outcomes making clear what the expected outcomes are for the awards must be noted for each award.

As with box P1.2, all parts of the section must be completed ie Title, Credit value and ECTS equivalent.

P1.4 Exit awards

Exit awards are only available to a student unable to meet the credit volume and/or credit level requirements for the award on which they are registered but who nevertheless, has completed a meaningful period of study and has satisfied the examiners that they have met identifiable learning outcomes. Eligibility criteria and exit award titles must be indicated in box 4.

Classified exit awards are only available for Level 6 and Level 7 awards; Level 5 and below awards are unclassified. If a programme does not want to offer an exit award then permission must be sought from the College Education Committee, via the Academic Standards Sub-Committee.

Only a single programme specification is required for the highest level of award, for example Master’s. Indication should be given in the “any specific criteria” box and box 18 of the exit points for the programme, for example Postgraduate Diploma, and the components of the curriculum required to be passed to achieve that particular award.

As with box P1.2, all parts of the section must be completed ie Title, Credit value and ECTS equivalent. Titles of exit awards should relate to Faculty and subject area e.g. UG Certificate in Biosciences Education (Nutrition) and will follow the agreed standard learning outcomes. The following statement should be noted on the programme “the following learning outcomes are applicable to all awards”. Where programmes wish to have programme specific exit awards then programme defined learning outcomes will need to be recorded on the programme specification.

P1.5 Level in the qualifications framework

This refers to the Framework for higher education qualifications published by the QAA, where each qualification is assigned to one particular level in the Framework. The levels with their associated qualifications are set out paragraph P1.2 above. Institutions are expected to be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes of each programme award match the qualification descriptors for the level of that particular award. These are built on using the generic level descriptors (see box M1.11 below).
P1.6 Attendance

Information should be provided on whether the programme is offered in full- or part-time mode or both or whether it is offered by distance learning. The minimum and maximum lengths of the programme should be provided, which must accord with the lengths of programmes as stipulated in the regulations). The maximum period of study as stated includes any periods of interruption.

Although it is recognised that there are resource implications for introducing greater flexibility into the attendance structure of programmes, it is recommended that flexibility is considered wherever possible. Issues such as attendance requirements, availability of the programme of study as either part- or full-time, the scope for transfer to alternative programmes and the scope for choice of modules or elements within the programme, will all have an impact on the accessibility of the programme and where possible should be considered at the design stage.

Those programmes offered as distance learning, are normally considered as part-time programmes. Consideration should be given on the number of hours a week a student would be expected to cover to ensure students are not overburdened with work and distance learning.

P1.7 Awarding institution/body

The awarding institution is King’s College London. If a programme has been agreed by the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee, as a joint award (see section 7 Procedures for programme and module approval and modification) then the name of the other institution should also be given.

P1.8 Teaching institution

The teaching institution is King’s College, although reference should be made to other bodies who contribute a substantial amount to the teaching of the programme, for example when another body delivers a complete module or more.

P1.9 Proposing department

All programmes should have an academic “home” in a designated department. Where programmes are taught by more than one department, the lead department should be given here.

P1.10 Programme organiser and contact details

This should be the academic organiser and contact details should include telephone number and email address.

P1.11 Relevant QAA subject benchmark/ PSRB guidelines

Subject benchmark statements are based around broad subject groupings which are designed to represent the conceptual framework of a discipline and to provide information about the understanding and skills acquired through the study of that discipline. Subject benchmark statements need to be considered in the design of a new programme, although it should be noted that for some programmes more than one benchmark statement may be relevant and for others there may not be any statements of direct relevance. Further information and the benchmark statements themselves can be found on the QAA web site at https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements
Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms

Where a programme is being accredited by a Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body then reference to the PSRB must be noted.

P1.12 **Date of programme (periodic) review**
Programmes are approved for a period of up to six years and re-approval is given by the process of periodic review which operates on a six-year cycle. Therefore, the date of periodic review is normally six years from the date of approval i.e. the first session in which a programme runs is year 1 of the cycle and it is reviewed in year 6. However, some Faculties operate periodic review on a departmental basis and review all the programmes in a department at one go. In this case, the date of periodic review will be the next date on which the department’s programmes are due to be reviewed (if falling before the six-year cycle ends) and it should be noted that the review will fall in line with the departmental review.

P1.13 **Educational aims of the programme**
The educational aims set out the purpose of the programme and are general statements about the learning that takes place over the duration of the programme, including the employability skills students are expected to achieve. Examples of aims for some College programmes are given below.

When defining the educational aims of the programme it is recommended that the core elements which are essential to the programme are justifiable and clearly articulated, so that students who may not be able to fulfil certain aspects due to illness/disability reasons, family/work commitments or religious practices for example can make informed decisions about whether to apply and are aware of the importance of communicating any relevant circumstances as early as possible.

It is also recommended that issues such as the degree to which the curriculum should and does reflect the needs, views and interests of a modern, diverse society (including employability) and takes account of scholarship within the discipline that covers the 9 protected characteristics as themes or topics should be taken into account.

The aims of the BA/BSc in Geography are to:
- provide a thorough training in the subject matter and techniques of Geography
- develop in students a range of intellectual, practical and transferable skills, embedding their practice and assessment within the process of learning about Geography
- encourage a spirit of enquiry among our students
- develop an ethical awareness of their place within a changing world
- develop detailed academic, practical and methodological knowledge based on students’ chosen degree pathway

The aims of the Pharmacy MPharm are to:
- deliver a pharmacy programme in an innovative, integrated and patient-focused manner
- provide education and training that is accredited by the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain
- provide students with the ability to integrate and critically evaluate multidisciplinary information leading to the application of pharmaceutical knowledge
- ensure the students’ understanding of the professional role of the pharmacist in society and how they contribute to the healthcare of the patients
- provide students with a thorough understanding of law and ethics relating to pharmacy

---

3 The nine protected characteristics covered by the Equality Act 2010 include: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership, race, religion and belief, sex and sexual orientation
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- develop students’ ability to provide advice on the use of medicines and the promotion of good health
- provide the student with opportunities for shared inter-professional education with other health science students including medicine, dentistry, midwifery, nutrition and nursing
- provide the students with the knowledge and skills to equip them for a career in pharmacy and pharmaceutical sciences

the aims of the MA in Ancient History are to:
- introduce students to skills essential for research in all major fields of Ancient History, and provide practical training to enable them to achieve technical competence as necessary
- provide a systematic study of specialized topics within Ancient History
- foster the ability to learn independently, either for further research or for individual intellectual development.

P1.14 Educational objectives of the programme/programme outcomes

The educational objectives and outcomes of the programme provide a concise summary of the main features of the programme and the learning outcomes that a typical student might reasonably be expected to achieve and demonstrate if s/he takes full advantage of the learning opportunities that are provided. The language used to describe learning outcomes should express them in terms that are measurable; typically, this will include phrases such as “to analyse”, “to demonstrate”, “to understand”. The learning and teaching methods deployed, and the type of assessment should allow students to achieve and demonstrate the learning outcomes, including those related to employability.

This section of the form should cover the intended outcomes for the programme in the four areas below and detail the associated teaching, learning and assessment methods. The outcomes should take account of external reference points such as benchmark statements and/or professional, statutory and regulatory body requirements. It is important that these outcomes relate closely to the overall educational aims and take account of the generic level descriptors.

For each award that a programme specification covers the descriptions should make clear where there are differences in outcomes associated with the different awards. Masters’ level programmes should clearly demonstrate a level of knowledge, understanding and skills above that expected from an undergraduate programme.

Knowledge and understanding
This is what the student should know and/or understand on completion of the programme. This will include the subject content, paradigms, conceptual basis, limitations and boundaries, and the contexts in which the subject is used.

Intellectual skills
These are cognitive skills such as an understanding of methodologies or ability in critical analysis. This will include skills such as thinking creatively or critically, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Practical skills
Practical skills incorporate professional skills and will include the ability to conduct laboratory work, research a topic or problem, observe, describe or report accurately or being able to undertake context/textual analysis. These will be developed through the student’s opportunity to practice in an appropriate learning context.

Generic/transferable skills
These skills are personal and social; they are key skills that are not discipline specific and are readily transferable to employment and other contexts. This includes communication, numeracy and the use of IT. For example, there may be an expectation that a programme
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Further guidance on how to write learning outcomes can be accessed via the Embedding Employability Toolkit.

P1.15 **Statement of how the programme has been informed by the relevant subject benchmark statement(s)/professional, statutory or regulatory body guidelines**

Subject benchmark statements provide a helpful starting point when designing a new programme or reviewing an existing programme. However, they are not the sole point of reference and should not be simply transposed into the outcomes of the programme specification. It is possible to put more emphasis on some aspects of the benchmark statement than others or to disagree with certain aspects provided this can be justified. For some programmes more than one benchmark statement may be relevant and for others there may not be any statements of direct relevance. Mention should also be made, if relevant, of how professional, statutory or regulatory body guidelines have been used. An example of a programme that utilises more than one benchmark statement is the BA in War Studies which provides the following statement for this section:

“The subject matter of War Studies has been informed by the Politics and International Relations benchmark statement, although much that would be relevant to a Politics and International Relations programme is not relevant to a subject-driven and multidisciplinary programme such as War Studies. Indeed War Studies is one of those endeavours described in the benchmark statement as cutting ‘across conventional knowledge based categories’ and whose ‘distinctive approaches to understanding and skills may need to draw on a wider range of materials and resources, including other benchmarks standards to capture fully the specific character of their particular degree programmes.’ The War Studies programme has been designed in this spirit. For example the History benchmark statement’s emphasis on increasing conceptual sophistication and increasing interpretative skills in terms of knowledge and progression is reflected in the differing expectations placed on War Studies students over their three years on the programme, viz:

Year 1: basic knowledge typically understood within the context of a single concept, theory or method.
Year 2: a broadening knowledge and deepening understanding, derived from a critical engagement with the subject, as well as awareness that this knowledge and understanding is constructed in the context of multiple concepts, theories and methods.
Year 3: specialised knowledge often located at or informed by a critical engagement with leading-edge developments in a particular area of War Studies, as well as broader knowledge understood within the context of a synthesis of concepts, theories or methods.”

P1.16 **Rationale for joint honours programmes**

All joint honours programmes should be underpinned by a clear intellectual rationale either educational or academic defined as follows:

an *educational* rationale applies to instances whereby the components of a joint honours degree, without necessarily overlapping at subject level, nonetheless provide the student with a greater breadth of complementary learning outcomes and thereby a more rounded education than afforded by a single honours degree.

an *academic* rationale applies to combinations where there is a significant overlap between the two subject areas in terms of knowledge and expertise and where studies in one component thereby shed light on studies in the other to enhance the student’s understanding of both.

A lead department and/or Faculty should be identified for all joint honours degrees programmes.
This section requires a map of the programme structure and the associated award requirements for both full-time and part-time modes of study. This information should also be provided for any variants of the programme such as joint honours and major/minor combinations or nested/exit awards. Programme designers should ensure that the learning outcomes of the various permutations of modules that can be taken will allow achievement of the stated learning outcomes for the programme overall.

A programme which is flexible in structure will almost by definition be more accessible, although the scope for flexibility will clearly vary from programme to programme. There are several ways in which a programme can be made to incorporate a greater degree of flexibility, although it is recognised that there may be sound arguments against flexible provision as the norm. In order to make use of these suggestions it is important to clarify the core elements or aspects of a programme (including any off-site provision such as placements or a year abroad), in order to make an assessment of where adjustments to teaching practices can occur. Suggestions for flexibility include:

- Clearly identifying which aspects of the curriculum are essential to a prescribed learning outcome and progression and which are more flexible;
- Clearly identifying whether flexibility exists over the pace of delivery for the whole programme of study, allowing students to choose to study part-time or full-time, or a mixture of both, at different times of their programme;
- Clearly indicating whether flexibility exists over the pace of delivery of individual modules, allowing students to either complete all aspects of a module as it is scheduled, or perhaps postpone some elements of it, such as parts of the assessment or a placement, for completion at a later date. This will allow students to take breaks without losing continuity for periods of illness or pregnancy etc;
- Providing a choice of modules within programmes of study, and ease of movement between such elements;
- Enabling flexibility over methods of delivery, for example learning packages, use of e-mail.

Where two subjects studied in a programme have approximately equal importance “and” is used in the title (each subject will be expected to have modules with a minimum value of 120 credits).

Going forward, greater flexibility is to be introduced into a programme. A new Curriculum Flexible Framework will be introduced during 2019/20 and should be consulted once finalised.

Information that appears in the regulations should not be repeated here as this applies universally to all programmes. If progression and award requirements are different from those specified in the Regulations then these need to be noted in the relevant box as do the maximum number of credits permitted with a condoned fail (core modules excluded as they cannot be condoned) and whether a programme allows substitute modules (where a student has failed a non core or non compulsory module). Any particular features of the programme such as a year abroad or a year spent in industry should be briefly described as should any additional non-credit requirements necessary to meet the requirements for award and whether students are permitted to take modules and acquire credit in addition to that required by their programme.
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It is recognised that the availability of optional modules may vary slightly from year to year. The component parts of the programme should be detailed in the programme structure table as follows:

**Code and title of the module**

*Credit level and credit value* - a module can only be assigned to one credit level and have one credit value. Units of credit are limited to multiples of 15 e.g. 15, 30, 45 or 60 and, for taught postgraduate programmes only, additional units of 5, 10 are also available, plus a 120 credit module for the project on MRes programmes. Requests to use larger or smaller units of credit should be referred to the College Education Committee for approval. For Masters’ programmes, the dissertation/research project element should follow the College Core Code of Practice for PGT research governance and dissertation framework.

*Status* of the module is whether it is introductory, core, compulsory, core/compulsory (one or more modules that must be taken and/or passed and that are selected from a group of modules), optional or a professional practice module for each type of programme.

An introductory module is one whose designated level falls below that designated for the level of the programme. It may be a pre-requisite for another module. It is not included in the credit tariff for a programme nor included in the classification calculation.

A core module is one that must be both taken and passed. A compulsory module is one that must be taken.

A professional practice module does not have a level nor is it included in the credit tariff for a programme nor in the award classification but may need to be passed to meet the requirements for progression and/or for award.

*Pre-requisite/co-requisite* requirements - please give the module code for any modules that are pre-requisite for another module or co-requisite. A module designated as a pre-requisite is one which a student must both take and pass in order to progress to another specified module.

*Assessment* – a brief outline of the assessment of each module should be provided e.g. written examinations, coursework. More specific details of the assessment for each component of the programme will be provided on the online Module Approval Form.

When designing assessment procedures it is important to utilise a range and variety of assessment methods, in order to enable students with a range of learning style and experience to demonstrate their aptitude. Assessment procedures should also be scrutinised to ensure that they are balanced and do not unfairly discriminate against any individual or group of students and that they give the students the opportunity to meet the modules learning aims and outcomes.

Where certain assessment procedures are justifiably core to the programme, this should be clearly articulated, and where they are not, alternate modes of assessment should be considered.

---

6 Terminology to be confirmed by College Education Committee September 2019
7 Terminology to be confirmed by College Education Committee September 2019
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P1.18 Marking criteria
The College has generic marking criteria which apply to the assessment of essays and dissertation/project reports. In addition, Faculties have produced discipline specific criteria which map onto the generic College criteria and reflect the principles embodied in the generic scheme. Neither of these criteria need to be reproduced but details/link to the scheme should be noted. Any marking criteria additional to the above, for example if a PSRB has any particular requirements should also be recorded.

All assessment schemes have to be approved by the relevant Assessment Board before final approval by the Academic Standards Sub-Committee which includes approval for the assessment of students undertaking study elsewhere, for example on an exchange agreement, and the approval of arrangements for the translation of marks obtained at another institution.

P1.19 Assessment Sub-board
Please indicate here whether the programme will report to an existing Assessment Sub-board, and if so which one, or whether a new Board will be set up, in which case please give the name of the new Board.

P1.20 External examiners
Please indicate whether the process for the nomination of external examiner(s) has commenced and provide the names of the external(s) if known.

P1.21 Measures to help ensure that the programme is inclusive to all students
An inclusive approach has its foundation in a commitment to promoting equality and diversity by embedding the following principles in the design process:

- **Anticipatory:** it is proactive in considering the entitlements of all students in the design and delivery of all activity. Adopting an anticipatory approach reduces the need for reactive and individualised responses that can arise when inclusive issues have not been considered at the design phase.

- **Flexible:** it is open, versatile and responsive to an evolving student population, and to changes in circumstances that may require adaptations to the timetable or delivery format to accommodate student availability, for instance blended learning.

- **Collaborative:** it builds on partnership between students, colleagues and other stakeholders to enrich the curriculum content and relevance. Staff must be receptive to feedback and recognise that developing inclusive provision is an ongoing process that benefits from the active involvement of all participants.

- **Transparent:** it makes clear the reason for design decisions by increasing general awareness of the benefits for all and reduces the possibility of misunderstandings based on perceived preferential treatment.

- **Equitable:** it ensures the processes and procedures used for students are the same and decisions are made in a fair, open and transparent way.

Please explain the measures that you have in place to ensure that the following aspects of the programme reflect the principles above: the aims, objectives/learning outcomes, structure,

---

8 This approach draws on work previously produced by the Higher Education Academy, Inclusive Curriculum Design
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Entry qualifications section

Entry profile

In line with the recommendations of the Schwartz report on *Fair admissions to higher education*, that an admissions system should be fair and transparent, the College has agreed that entry profiles will be produced for each programme of study which will clarify the academic and non-academic entrance criteria required. Any skills, attributes or knowledge which are essential for the successful completion of the programme should be identified in the entry profile and conveyed to students in information about the programme. The entry profile is divided into three sections as follows:

P2.1 Academic criteria

This should list which subjects are required at which particular level. All stated academic criteria should be objectively justified and relevant to the student’s ability to complete the programme. Compulsory subjects should be included where appropriate as should subjects which are not considered. Other qualifications and international equivalences can be determined and advertised with the advice of the Admissions Office.

P2.2 Any additional criteria

All stated non-academic criteria should be objectively justified and relevant to the student’s ability to complete the programme. If the programmes does not have any non-academic criteria then it should read “Not applicable”.

Non-academic criteria should be framed in such a way, as to be achievable by students from differing backgrounds and who have access to differing levels of opportunity.

P2.3. Interviewing policy

This should include information about whether applicants are interviewed and if so the format of the interview. The interviewing policy should be applied consistently for all applicants. See the College-wide interviewing policy and guidelines for more information ([https://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/Students/Admissions-Interview-Policy](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/governancezone/Students/Admissions-Interview-Policy)).

The information on entry requirements published by UCAS and in College prospectuses is generally a year ahead of the programme specification. It is therefore worth noting that the entry profile that is given on the programme specification relates to the year of the programme specification; therefore a 2019/20 programme specification will have a 2019/20 entry profile, rather than a 2020/21 or 2021/22 profile. The most up to date entry information should be available in the College on-line prospectus.

Further advice on entry profiles can be sought from the Directorate of Admissions and Registry Services in the Directorate of Students and Education.

P2.4 Any additional information

This should note whether there are any legal eligibility checks that need to be undertaken. Further advice can be sought from the Director of Admissions and Registry Services in the Directorate of Students and Education.

Collaborative provision section

This section of the documentation collects information on various types of collaborative activity such as joint awards, programmes that operate in collaboration with another body or where the

---

9 Which should clearly articulate where there are elements of the programme which are justified as being core, including any aspects of assessment, learning and teaching
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P3.1 Collaborative provision
Please indicate which of the various types of collaborative activity the programme is involved with, see Definitions of collaborative activity for more information.

P3.2 Joint award, double award, multiple award, dual award or validated provision
A joint award is one in which a single award is made jointly by two or more awarding institutions. Approval from the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee is required before a joint award with another institution can be offered. Further information on the process to be followed is given in Section C Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision. Faculties should not approve joint programmes such as these until approval has been given by the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee.

The approved copy of the Collaborative Provision Partner Profile and checklist form (for new activity\(^\text{10}\)) submitted to the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee should be attached to the programme approval documentation. Where arrangements have been put in place with an existing partner and the same activity, a summary statement should be attached.

Likewise, double, multiple or dual awards should also gain approval from the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee before it can be offered.

See Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes for further guidance.

It is not anticipated that the College will be entering into any validated provision in the near future but if consideration was to be had then a clear academic rationale would need to be presented to the Vice-Principal (Education) in the first instance.

P3.3 Partnership programme - delivery of programmes away from College campuses by bodies external to the College
Information should be provided in this box on elements of a programme that are delivered away from the main College campus by a body external to the College. It is expected that a visit to any off-site location will be made before the programme is put forward for approval to the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent) and a report of the visit should be attached to the documentation (template form available at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/Collaborative-Provision/collabprov).

When designing a placement or period of study abroad, it will be important to consider a variety of issues at the design stage, in order to ensure the experience is inclusive for all students and that the College is offering a parity of provision. The College’s legal obligations, relevant to equalities legislation also apply to students on placement. Furthermore, in relation to disabled students, the legislation stipulates that in cases where the College arranges for a third party to provide education, training or other related services for students on its behalf, this provision remains the responsibility of the College and so is covered by the legislation.

Note should be taken of the Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity.

\(^{10}\) This relates to either: new activity with an existing partner or new activity with a new partner
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P3.4 Recognition of study or award of credit through off-campus study or placement
Information should be provided on the type of activity that the student will be undertaking, i.e. a year abroad, a year in employment, a placement in a professional or educational environment, internships, the length of time this will take, the amount of credit and whether this is a compulsory or optional part of the programme. Information is not needed on placements that are a requirement of a professional, statutory or regulatory body.

P3.5 Rationale for time outside the College
All the activity listed above should have a clear rationale and evidence of how this will enhance the student experience (this information does not need to be provided for those programmes where placements are a requirement of a professional, statutory or regulatory body). Note should be taken of the Guidance on student placements.

P3.6 Validation/accreditation by a professional, regulatory or statutory body
Information should be provided on the relevant PSRB, commencement date of the validation/accreditation and the dates of validation/accreditation events. Where the professional, statutory or regulatory body has a policy on recruitment of disabled people, it will be important to be conversant with the details, including information about the possible “reasonable adjustments” that can be made whilst also maintaining academic standards.

Administrative information
The information collected in this section is to allow the programme to be set up on SITS. Much of the information is also required for the purposes of the College’s statutory return to HESA.

P4.1 Programme name
As before.

P4.2 Programme code
The programme code will be available via OPAMA. Queries on programme coding should be directed to Registry.

P4.3 JACS code (now known as The Higher Education Classification Subjects (HECoS))
Please select the most appropriate code from the list at the following web address, there may be some programmes for which two HECoS codes are appropriate
https://www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/hecos

P4.4 Estimated intake
The estimated intake of UK/EU and International students should reflect that in the Faculty business plan.

P4.5 Campus

P4.6 Duration
Information should be provided on the start time of the programme and whether it runs according to an academic year (September – June, or September to September) or a calendar year (January to December) or any other duration. If there is more than one entry point during a year this should also be given. If any years of the programme are longer than the standard for that particular type of programme, information should be provided on the length of the non-standard year. Details of the term dates should be provided if the programme does not follow standard term dates. Any variations to the standard term dates should first have been approved by the Academic Board.
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P4.7 Finance
The major source of finance is usually Office for Students\textsuperscript{11} or the DoH but please list other sources or indicate if the programme is self-financing. For advice on allocating programmes to price groups please contact SPA or Faculty Directors of Administration.

P4.8 Contributing departments/divisions/Faculties
If the programme is not taught solely within the proposing department/division/Faculty, information should be provided on the nature of the involvement of other departments, for example delivery of a compulsory module. If it is possible to state the percentage that this contributes to the overall programme then this information should be provided. In cases where a contributing department delivers an optional module it may not be possible to state the percentage as this will vary depending on the number of modules available; in this case please state as such.

The approval process
P5.2 Initial approval by Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee
Initial approval by the Faculty Education Committee/Vice Dean Education, Dean of Faculty and territorial Vice-Principal is required to ensure that the proposed programme is consistent with the Faculties academic and business plan and that an appropriate business plan and marketing plan have been produced. Additionally initial approval is required from the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee to enable the College to take a strategic overview of its new programme development.

The date the Programme Proposal Form was approved by the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee should be noted to indicate that initial approval has been given by both the Vice Dean Education, Executive Dean of Faculty, territorial Vice-Principal and the College. The business, marketing and careers plan is then attached to the Programme Approval Form.

P5.3 Consultation at the planning stage
Proposers of new programmes should liaise with a range of professional services staff to ensure that the new programme can be supported in terms of learning resources. Similarly, any additional requirements that the programme may make in terms of, for example, space requirements, academic facilities or student services should be discussed with the relevant senior officer. The Faculty Education Committee, or equivalent, in approving the programme will ensure that such liaison has taken place and, where additional services/support are required, that this has the approval of the relevant area.

New academic staffing should be considered and consulted at the Faculty Planning Round meetings. All requests should be completed by December each year.

An indication should be given of which other departments/Faculties have been consulted during the design of the new programme to ensure that all relevant parties have had a chance to make an input.

P5.4 Approval by the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent)
Following approval of the programme, the relevant email noting approvals from the Chair of the Faculty Education Committee, the member of the CEC/FEC from another Faculty and the external peer appointed to the Faculty for the purposes of programme approval and review should be uploaded onto OPAMA.

If a programme is approved subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions, then these approvals are only sought once these conditions have been met. Any submissions to

\textsuperscript{11} Previously HEFCE
Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms OPAMA that are missing any of these signatures will be deemed by the College not to have been formally approved and will be returned to the Faculty for completion.

Some Faculties may opt to establish sub-committees of the Faculty Education Committee to consider the detailed scrutiny of programme approval documentation. In such cases, it remains the responsibility of the Faculty Education Committee to give the final formal approval to the programme and for the Chair to sign it off.

P5.5 Approval for joint honours programmes/jointly taught programmes
Joint honours programmes and those jointly taught between Faculties, regardless of the amount of teaching involved, should be approved by the Education Committees of both/all Faculties and signed off by the Chairs of both/all.

P5.6 Final notification to Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee/approval if deemed complex
Following submission of Faculty approved forms to QSE, officers in QSE will check the documentation submitted. If all agreed, then date of agreement will be noted, and the approval noted at the next PDASC meeting.

Where complex programmes are put forward the documentation will be considered at the next PDASC meeting. Once the formal approval has been given then officers in QSE will advise marketing and admissions department of this final approval.

Section 6 – external specialist advice
P6.1 Report of the external specialist
The external specialist can be either a peer in the same subject area from another institution, a member of a professional, regulatory or statutory body, an employer with links to the subject area or from business or industry. Former external examiners can be used in this capacity as can current examiners, provided that the latter do not subsequently act as external examiner for the programme in question for a period of three academic years. For further information see Guidance for Faculties on the use of external specialist and external peers for programme approval and review.

The external specialist is asked to provide a brief report on the programme to include:

• the nature of the interaction with the Department/Faculty ie attendance at programme planning meetings, electronic communication, scrutiny of documentation;
• the extent to which the programme meets a defined market need;
• subject content;
• engagement with the various points of reference of the national quality assurance framework such as the Framework for higher education qualifications and subject benchmark statements, if applicable;
• engagement with the requirements of a professional, statutory or regulatory body, if applicable.

An electronic signature from the external specialist will be acceptable.

For any proposed Foundation Degree programme, or distance learning programme, the specialist should also have some knowledge of and involvement in the type of programme being proposed to enable an appropriate input to the proposed programme.
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P6.2 Response of the department
The department should indicate briefly how they have taken on board the comments of the external specialist. This is in order to make clear that the paperwork reflects any amendments recommended by the external specialist.

Module approval form (the online form is available at: https://mykcl.kcl.ac.uk/). Please note that the following information may not be in the order of the online system. User guides for the system are available at: https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/approvalandmod/index.
Once inputted and approved, SITS will be automatically updated with the details of the module.
Please note that currently this does not apply to Short Courses. For guidance on short courses please review the Short Course Policy (see Section H).

M1.1 Module title
The module title should be no longer than 120 characters.

M1.2 Study Abroad
If the module, albeit sometimes with a different form of assessment, is also offered to Study Abroad students, this should be indicated here.

M1.3 Module code
Faculty/Campus Offices should be consulted for advice on the local rules governing the allocation of codes to modules. If the module is available for Study Abroad students with a different form of assessment then the module should be allocated a separate code. If Study Abroad students take the module and its assessment exactly the same as King’s students then no separate code is required.

M1.4 Subject area
Please click on the following link and select the most appropriate code https://www.hesa.ac.uk/innovation/hecos

M1.5 Credit level
Credit levels define the level of complexity, relative demand and autonomy expected of a learner on completion of the unit of learning. A module can only be allocated to one credit level.

M1.6 Credit value
The College’s credit framework utilises standard credit tariffs where 1 credit equals 10 hours of notional learning (which includes teaching, private study, revision and assessment). It is important to note, however, that the notional hours of learning in UK credit systems is a proxy measure of the volume of the learner effort required by the average learner at that time to achieve the required learning outcomes of the programme. It is difficult to state rigidly the time it takes any individual student to learn, therefore it is important to emphasise that the learning ‘time’ is regarded as a broad estimate. In this way notional hours of learning must, only, be employed as a rough guide. This is particularly relevant when equating UK credit to ECTS credits. As mentioned above in paragraph P1.2, the workload of a full-time student during one academic year is calculated to be 60 ECTS credits which equates to 120 UK credits. Further guidance is available at:

UUK International Unit
ECTS Users Guide
QAA general guidance on the use of credit
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http://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/academic-credit-higher-education-in-england-an-introduction.pdf?sfvrsn=a3b3f981_14

The units of credit available are multiples of 15 e.g. 15, 30, 45 and 60 for undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. Postgraduate programmes may also have additional units of 5, 10 and 90 and 120 credit modules for the project on MRes programmes. Approval to use any other size unit of credit should be sought from the College Education Committee. Smaller shorter units can be accommodated by “bundling” them together with other small/short modules, however if there is a case to be made for having a module valued at less than 15 credits (at UG level), again approval should be sought first from the College Education Committee. For Masters’ programmes, the dissertation/research project element should follow the College guidelines (see Guidance for taught postgraduate dissertations).

M1.7 Teaching institution (if not King’s College)
If an outside body is responsible for delivering the module please provide the full name of the other body.

M1.8 Proposing department
All modules should have an academic “home” in a designated department. Where modules are taught by more than one department, the lead department should be given here.

M1.9 Module organiser and contact details
This should be the academic organiser and contact details should include telephone number and email address.

M1.10 Educational aims of the module
The educational aims of the module are brief general statements of the overall purpose of the module, for example:

“to provide an understanding of recent conservation policy-making and its impact upon patterns of land use in the UK.”

M1.11 Learning outcomes of the module
The learning outcomes specify what the student will be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of the module, including any employability learning outcomes. They are usually expressed in terms of knowledge, understanding and skills, for example:

“by the end of the module the student will be able to demonstrate a knowledge of the linguistic, literary, cultural and socio-historical contexts in which Anglo-Saxon literature is written and read.”
“by the end of the module the student will be able to evaluate the scope and limitations of DNA-based diagnostic tests.”
“by the end of the module the student will be able to work co-operatively with others in the design and organisation of a laboratory-based experiment.”

The aims and outcomes for a particular module should be consistent with the overall aims and outcomes for the programme to which it contributes and should take account of the generic level descriptors available at http://www.seec.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/SEEC-descriptors-2016.pdf

A good practice to adopt in module approval is to view the module and its delivery from the perspective of the student and the way in which information is imparted to them. It is expected therefore that, as part of their approval processes, in addition to receiving information on aims and learning outcomes, Faculties will give detailed consideration to such matters as the proposed syllabus for a module, consideration of seminar topics and bibliographies.
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Further guidance on how to write learning outcomes can be accessed via the Embedding Employability Toolkit.

M1.12 Prohibited combinations
The title and code of those modules that cannot be taken in combination with the proposed module should be provided, together with the programme to which this prohibition relates.

M1.13 Pre-requisites
Please list the title and code for those modules for which the proposed module is a pre-requisite and those modules which are a pre-requisite for the proposed module. A module designated as a pre-requisite is one which a student must both take and pass in order to progress to another specified module.

M1.14 Contact time/directed study
Please indicate here the approximate number of hours for each activity to give an overall picture of the workload a student taking the module would be expected to undertake, including placements and self-guided learning. Please also indicate whether any of the activity is delivered via e-learning e.g. lectures, seminars, tutorials etc. Apart from placements and self-guided learning it is expected that the other activities are all taught sessions that involve contact between staff and students.

M1.15 Assessment pattern – for King’s students
The type of assessment used to assess the modules should be appropriate to the learning outcomes and should therefore allow a judgement to be made as to whether the learning outcomes have been achieved.

The pass mark is assigned to the credit level, not the programme level. For credits at levels 4, 5, and 6 a pass mark of 40 will normally be required, and for credits at level 7 a pass mark of 50 is required. Some programmes leading to professional registration may require higher pass marks than the College minimum.

“Mandatory to pass/qualifying mark” relates to those instances when an individual component of the assessment must be passed in order to pass the module overall. Please indicate whether the component has to be passed at the passmark or whether there is a qualifying mark. In the case of the latter the mark is usually below the standard passmark and relates to cases where students may not reach the pass mark standard in one component but achieve very highly in another. A qualifying mark allows them to still pass the overall module on the basis of their higher mark as long as the qualifying mark has been met.

For modules that are assessed by more than one element of assessment please indicate what format the reassessment will take e.g. all elements are re-assessed, only those elements with a qualifying mark are re-assessed, re-assessment is on a pass/fail basis only to determine whether the student has achieved the learning outcomes of the module. Where an element of assessment is defined as a core competency as part of a professional practice requirement, please indicate how many attempts are permitted to allow a student to achieve the required standard. For further information on re-assessment see the Regulations.

M1.16 Assessment pattern – Study Abroad students
Where Study Abroad students take a different form of assessment, details should be provided in this table. The assessment, although of a different form, should still be appropriate and sufficient to assess the learning outcomes of the module.

M1.17 Examples of recommended key texts
Please indicate here examples of recommended key texts for students.
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M1.18 Useful websites
If relevant, please indicate any websites that might be of use for students.

Section 2 – supplementary information
This section will not be relevant for all modules.

M2.1 Delivery of modules away from College campuses by bodies external to the College
Information should be provided on elements of the module that are delivered away from the main College campus by a body external to the College. Whilst primarily designed to apply to programmes, the principals of the College Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity, may also be relevant here.

Section 3 – administrative information

M3.1 Module name
As before.

M3.2 Start date
This is the month and year in which the module is first available.

M3.3 Numbers
Some modules set maximum limits for the numbers of students that can take the module at any one time and some set a minimum number, below which the module will not run. Please enter either/both of these if applicable.

M3.4 Availability
Please indicate the dates that the module will be available and when the examination will take place. If the module is being run more than once during the year indicate both sets of dates that it will be available, along with the dates of the examination. Also indicate if the module runs over more than one semester. Please indicate if the timing of examinations is different for Study Abroad students.

M3.5 Superseded modules
Please list any modules that the proposed module supersedes and indicate whether such modules have ever been taught or examined.

M3.6 Contributing departments/divisions/Faculties
If the module will not be taught exclusively within the proposing department please give details of the other areas involved, the nature of their involvement, for example delivery of 10 lectures, joint running of the module, and the % of the total module that this comprises.

Section 4 – the approval process

M4.1 Module name
As before.

M4.2 Initial approval/consultation at the planning stage
Proposers of new modules should liaise with Library Services to ensure that the new module can be supported in terms of learning resources. Similarly, any additional requirements that the module may make in terms of, for example space requirements or other academic facilities should be discussed with the relevant senior officer. The Faculty Education Committee in approving the module will ensure that such liaison has taken place and, where additional services/support are required, that this has the approval of the relevant areas. All details of additional resources must be approved.

Any module involving activity where the subjects are human should be assessed to ascertain whether it requires ethical approval. Examples of such types of activity are those which
Guidance on the production of programme specifications and the completion of programme and module approval and modification forms involve some kind of physical procedure or administering of questionnaires, conducting and/or taking part in interviews and making video or audio recordings for educational use. If ethical approval is required this should be obtained before the module can be approved by the Faculty Education Committee, see *Guidance on risk and ethics assessment in the design of modules*.

M4.3 Approval by the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent)

Approval from the Faculty Education Committee will be sought online, with the Chair of FEC having final sign off. If a module is approved subject to the fulfilment of certain conditions, then the module should only have final sign-off once these conditions have been met.

M4.4 Approval for modules jointly taught by more than one Faculty

Modules jointly taught by more than one Faculty, regardless of the amount of teaching involved, should be approved by the Education Committee of both/all Faculties and electronically (online) signed off by the Chairs of both/all.

**Modification form for programmes and modules** (modifications to both programme and modules must be made online at: [https://mykcl.kcl.ac.uk/](https://mykcl.kcl.ac.uk/))

**Modifications to programmes and modules cannot be implemented in the same academic year in which they are approved.** When modifying programmes the following considerations need to be held: what impact would these changes have on the information that is currently available? Would this modification have an impact on student expectations who have registered interest in the programme already? Would the modification have an impact on those students who had registered to enrol onto the programme in the new academic year i.e. information provided by the *Programme Information sheets*?

To aid Faculties/Departments in determining whether a modification is major or minor (and whether consultation is required with students) a *Table of major and minor modifications* is available online.

A rationale of the modification proposed should be provided in the appropriate section of the online form, along with noting the line table from the *Major and Minor modifications table*. Where a programme is being closed or suspended then confirmation should be provided that those remaining students on the programme will be fully supported12 (see the *Policy on closing or suspending a programme of study*).

If any modifications affect the content of the programme specification and/or programme regulations then these should be updated on the online system.

At the end of each academic year a check of the information provided online to that provided by the *Programme Information Sheets* will be undertaken. Where there are perceived to be conflicts then Faculties will be approached to review and rectify the programme specification accordingly. These will then become the definitive specification for the following academic year.

---

12 For those programmes identified to be closed via the Portfolio Simplification exercise, a separate process will be following to close the programme
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College descriptor for standard learning outcomes for exit awards

The College has approved the following standard learning outcomes for exit awards. Where programmes are following these statements the following must be noted on the programme specification “the following learning outcomes are applicable to all awards”. Where programmes wish to have programme defined learning outcomes these are noted on the programme specifications:

UG Certificate (Level 4): in order to be awarded a UG Cert HE students should be able to demonstrate:
- some knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with their field of study;
- an ability to evaluate and interpret concepts and principles within the context of their field;
- an ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data;
- an ability to develop lines of argument;
- an ability to make sound judgements in accordance with the basic theories and concepts of their field.

These are the standard UG Cert HE learning outcomes; faculty may approve additional programme specific learning outcomes for this exit award, if required, as long as the standard criteria are met.

UG Diploma (Level 5): in order to be awarded a UG Dip HE students should be able to demonstrate:
- knowledge and critical understanding of the well-established principles of their field of study, and of the way in which those principles have developed;
- an ability to apply underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, including, where appropriate, the application of those principles in an employment context;
- knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the field of study;
- an ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study;
- an understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations which might be based on that knowledge.

These are the standard UG Dip HE learning outcomes; faculty may approve additional programme specific learning outcomes for this exit award, if required, as long as the standard criteria are met.

Ordinary degrees (Level 6): in order to be awarded an Ordinary Degree students should be able to demonstrate:
- an understanding of some key aspects of their field of study, including the acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the field;
- an ability to deploy established techniques of analysis and enquiry within the field of study;
- an ability to devise arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of the field of study;
- an ability to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or scholarship in the field of study;
- some appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge;
- an ability to manage their own learning;
- some ability to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the field of study).
These are the standard Ordinary Degree learning outcomes; faculty may approve additional programme specific learning outcomes for this exit award, if required, as long as the standard criteria are met.

**Postgraduate Certificate (Level 7):** in order to be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate students should be able to demonstrate:

- an understanding of knowledge, and an awareness of current problems and/or new insights, in their field;
- an understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or scholarship
- some originality in the application of knowledge;
- a practical understanding of how established techniques of enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the field;
- a conceptual understanding that enables the student to evaluate current research and scholarship in the field;

These are the standard PG Cert learning outcomes; faculty may approve additional programme specific learning outcomes for this exit award, if required, as long as the standard criteria are met.

**Postgraduate Diploma (Level 7):** in order to be awarded a Postgraduate Diploma students should be able to demonstrate:

- an understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, in their field;
- an understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or scholarship
- some originality in the application of knowledge;
- a practical understanding of how established techniques of enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the field;
- a conceptual understanding that enables the student to evaluate current research and scholarship in the field.

These are the standard PG Dip learning outcomes; faculty may approve additional programme specific learning outcomes for this exit award, if required, as long as the standard criteria are met.
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1. **Introduction**
   1.1 The involvement of external specialist and peers in the process of programme, design, approval and review compliments the external advice already provided via the external examiner system and thus provides an enhancement of the College’s quality assurance processes.

   1.2 For programme approval there are two forms of external input expected: input from externals at the subject level, external specialists, who provide comment on the content of a new programme from a specialist viewpoint: and input from externals at the level to the Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent), external peers, who have a broader understanding of the discipline, their main function to provide an external viewpoint on the approval process. The same external peers are also used for programme review.

   1.3 The following guidance is designed to make clear the responsibilities of departments, Faculties and the College at the various stages of the process.

2. **External specialist**
   2.1 At the development stage of a new programme, Departments identify a suitable external specialist. The role of the external specialist is to provide expert subject advice at the design stage of a new programme. The specialist can be an academic, a member of a professional or statutory body, an employer with links to the subject area or from business or industry. Former external examiners can act in this capacity, as can current external examiners, provided that the latter do not subsequently act as external examiner for the programme in question for a period of three academic years. Former members of staff of the College are eligible to act as external specialists, provided that a period of three years has elapsed since their employment with the College.

   2.2 The Department should provide the external specialist with a copy of the *Notes of Guidance for external specialists and external peers* which is available from the QSE section or on the web at [https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/extspecialistspeers](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/extspecialistspeers) and direct the external specialist to the *Procedures for programme and module approval and modification* which can also be found on the QSE webpage [https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/approvalandmod/index](https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/approvalandmod/index) Departments should also provide copies of any relevant department information.

   2.3 The external specialist should be invited to comment on the content of the proposed programme. This will include considerations such as the academic standard of the programme, relationship with any subject benchmark statement and/or relevant professional, regulatory or statutory body guidelines and the potential market for the programme. The specialist is asked to complete a brief report of the nature of their involvement in the process and their views of the programme. The department should then indicate briefly how the comments have been taken on board to ensure that the final documentation reflects the recommendations from external specialists. The report from the external specialist and the department response forms part of the programme approval process and should be submitted alongside the other approval documentation to the Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent). The Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent) should not approve any programme that is missing this report.
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2.4 The external specialists are not formally appointed by the College as the anticipated pattern will act in a “one-off” capacity. They will receive a payment of £200 for this engagement. Faculties should ensure that the external specialist is provided with the appropriate payment forms and these have been completed and approved by the Chair of the Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent). Once the programme has been approved by the Faculty the paperwork, including the external specialist payment forms, are forwarded onto QSE section; they will arrange the payment of fees and expenses to the external specialist.

3. **External peers**

3.1 One or two external peers will be appointed to each Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent) for all quality assurance matters. Appointments will be made by the College Education Committee on the recommendation of Faculties. External peers should meet three or more of the following criteria:

- experience within their own institution of either the role of Head/Dean of Department/Faculty or Programme Director and/or chairmanship of an institutional level committee concerned with teaching and learning or other senior role. If the nominated peer is a recent retiree i.e. retired in the last year, then the College will appoint on a two year basis only, with no extension to tenure;
- wide experience as an external examiner;
- familiarity with research-led teaching;
- familiarity with national quality assurance policies;
- knowledge of and experience of using subject benchmark statements;
- previous experience as a QAA institutional auditor/reviewer.

3.2 Former external examiners to the College will be eligible to be nominated as external peers but current external examiners are not eligible to serve in this capacity. External peers will not be able to subsequently act as external examiner for any programmes they have been involved in approving until a period of three years has elapsed. Former members of staff of the College are eligible to act as external peers, provided that a period of three years has elapsed since their employment with the College. An appointee shall not normally belong to an institution in which a member of staff of King’s College London is appointed to act as an external examiner in the same discipline in which the peer would be asked to review.

3.3 External peers will be appointed on a two-year contract in the first instance, with the possibility of renewal for a maximum of one further two-year period. On completion of the appointment an external peer will not normally be eligible for re-appointment until a period of two years has elapsed. The QSE section will organise the appointment process and will provide external peers with copies of College policies relating to programme approval and review and the Notes of Guidance for external specialists and external peers. Faculties should provide external peers with any additional local guidance on programme approval and review, together with terms of reference of the Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent) and dates of meeting of the Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent). External peers are expected to attend at least 50% Faculty Education Committee meetings each year.

3.4 **Programme approval**

External peers will be expected to take an overview of the approval process and to ensure that appropriate attention is given to the setting and maintenance of academic standards during this process. Faculties should ensure that external peers receive copies of proposals for all new programmes in advance of the meeting of the Faculty Education Committee (or its equivalent). The external peer will be expected to attend in person all programme approval panels, although in exceptional circumstances where this is not possible they should
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3.6 At the end of their contract external peers will be asked to provide a report on their experience and to suggest any areas for further improvement.

3.7 External peers will receive an annual payment of £1,000 which will be paid at the end of the academic year. Reimbursement of expenses for travel and any other associated costs will be made as they occur, on presentation of a claim supported by receipts. The QSE section will arrange the payment of fees and expenses to the external peers.
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Guidance on flexible and distributed learning

The following guidance has been written to assist those developing flexible and distance learning programmes (including e-learning). The QAA Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: Learning and teaching advises institutions, in setting up such programmes, to take into consideration a number of points.

In distance learning, learners are physically and/or temporally remote from each other and their ‘teachers’. In open learning, learners study in their own time and at their own pace. Open and distance learning (ODL) is the term coined to cover the common ground between both types of learner. It is up to the educator to decide the scales of openness and distance they want or expect their learners to have.

It is generally considered that students enrolling onto a distance learning programme must have the following to enable them to complete their studies without being disadvantaged for not attending lectures on campus:

- extended access to a computer with Word, Excel, Internet Explorer, a media player software and a CD Rom drive;
- regular access to the Internet for visiting web based discussion boards, email and some online library research;
- need to be a confident user of the internet, although some places make themselves available to coach students through to becoming familiar with the web-based discussion format and to address other IT questions;
- time: this approach to learning requires students to read a lot and regularly check into the web-based discussions.

Flexible learning describes approaches to teaching and learning which are learner-centred, free up the place, time and methods for learning and teaching, and use appropriate technologies in a networked environment (Moran 1998). The pedagogical philosophy behind flexible learning is student centred and focuses on student learning. Effective learning presupposes active students who are responsible for their own learning. The teacher’s role is not to transmit knowledge, as often is the case in traditional university teaching, but to facilitate the student’s learning.

Further information
- HEFCE strategy for e-learning
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Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity

1. Introduction
1.1 The College is responsible for the academic standards quality of all learning opportunities delivered in its name and ensuring that where this is delivered by a Partner the arrangements are implemented securely and managed effectively in accordance with the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance: Partnerships and Work-based learning.

1.2 This guidance is designed to support the implementation of the College’s Partnerships policy as outlined in the College’s ‘Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision’ at Section C and provides advice on delivering the operational aspects of the collaborative programme.

1.3 The guidance is applicable to all collaborative provision activity where the achievement of the learning opportunity undertaken as part of a module or programme of study that leads to the award of academic credit or a qualification offered by the College is dependent on the arrangement made with a body/institution external to King’s.

2. Initial stages
2.1 Proposals may be initiated by the College or the Partner and will not be considered unless it can be demonstrated that the partnership arrangement supports the delivery of the College’s strategic vision, including its international strategy and involve partners of equivalent standing or unique capability that will benefit the College.

2.2 Effective communication with the Partner should be undertaken from the outset to ensure a mutual understanding of the learning opportunity being delivered and that appropriate levels of resources (including staff) can be committed to the arrangement to ensure that the necessary oversight is maintained. Consideration should also be given to the timescales for approving the arrangement from both the Partner and College perspective.

2.3 All arrangements entered into must be compliant with King’s policies and procedures and meet the requirements of the Academic regulations and the Core code of practice for postgraduate research degrees, ensuring consistency with the academic experience and pastoral care arrangements for students offered by the College. The default position will be that all College policies, regulations and procedures will apply for all operational aspects of a programme. Where it is proposed to vary these arrangements then explicit permission must be granted as part of the programme approval process.

2.4 When designing the programme, the learning delivered by the Partner should be mapped against that being delivered by College, taking into account level descriptors, notional learning hours and programme structure. For Joint PhDs this should include when students will reach key milestones. Consideration should be given to ensuring that the student will be able to demonstrate that they have acquired the level of knowledge, understanding and skills expected to meet the overall learning aims and outcomes and academic standards of the final award. The details of the Partner involvement should be included in the relevant section of the Programme Approval Form.

2.5 All proposals are subject to a risk assessment and due diligence process prior to the approval of the activity. The College’s ‘Definitions of collaborative activity’ provide information on the risk impact of each type of activity against the categories of risk identified by the College as posing a threat to the College’s business operations.
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2.6 When assessing ‘Partner-specific’ risks consideration should be given to the political, geographical, ethical and cultural requirements of the Partner Country to allow for student success, equality of opportunity and access to study, especially where language barriers or a different learning experience may apply. An assessment should be made as to whether the other site has relevant equal opportunities policies in place, including policies relating to disability, has systems in place for supporting students with disabilities and has an identified contact to whom students with disabilities can be directed.

2.7 When assessing ‘Academic’ risks consideration should be given to how to evaluate the learning opportunity being delivered by the Partner to ensure it will meets the academic standards of a King’s award and will be compliant with King’s policies and procedures. A mapping of Partner processes should be undertaken to identify any variances in practice. The default position is to apply King’s practice in this respect, but where this is not possible or practicable, approval must be sought from the relevant College Committee at the outset. For Joint Awards consideration should be given to whose set of regulations will be followed in each aspect of the student lifecycle. It may therefore be useful to establish a bespoke set of regulations to govern the programme, providing these are compliant with the College’s policy and procedures to meet the requirements of the Academic Regulations and the Core Code of Practice for Postgraduate Research Degrees. Where home rules apply, consideration should be given to where the Partner regulations may still impact on the student and how to make students aware of this.

2.8 When assessing ‘Legal’ risks consideration should be given to ascertaining the national legislation and national or regional frameworks of the Partner. The Partner must be willing to recognise and support the College’s obligations under UK law, particularly in respect of equalities law and data protection. Furthermore, in relation to students with a disability, the legislation stipulates that in cases where the College arranges for a third party to provide education, training or other related services for students on its behalf, then this provision remains the responsibility of the College, including ensuring compliance with CMA and OIAHE obligations. Where the activity is for a Joint Award, the College must be satisfied that a Partner is legally empowered to contract with the College and has the necessary legal and regulatory capacity to grant academic awards jointly with the College. The College has legal templates in place to support this process and further guidance is available through the College’s Legal Services Resources webpage.

2.9 When assessing ‘Financial’ risks consideration should be given to ensuring that the partnership activity is fully sustainable and that adequate safeguards are in place to protect against financial impropriety or conflicts of interest that may impact on the academic standards or the quality of learning opportunities.

2.10 When assessing ‘Resource’ risks consideration should be given to how the learning and staff resources delivered by the Partner will be assessed to ensure that the necessary oversight is sustained and that the quality and standards are equivalent to comparable awards delivered solely by the College. Where possible/practicable such assessment should include a visit to the site by the department/area proposing the programme and confirm the following:
  - **Learning opportunities**: the quality of the learning opportunities offered through a collaborative provision arrangement must be of a sufficiently high quality and enable a student to achieve the academic standards required for the award.
  - **Students**: where a collaborative provision activity involves students, the status of the student and their formal relationship with the College should be clearly defined. Students should receive information about their status and its implications in respect of their rights (e.g. access to learning support resources and to appeals and complaints procedures).
- **Staff**: where appropriate, staff development should be provided by both/all partners to ensure that staff will have the necessary underpinning knowledge to support the activity. Where staff of the College are required to visit an overseas institution or work overseas, attention will be given to their terms and conditions of employment.

2.11 As part of the overall process for assessing and monitoring risks, it is useful to establish a risk register setting out why risk could happen (i.e. the likelihood), the possible consequences for the College (i.e. the impact) and an action plan on how identified risks will be contained or reduced. This should also take into account whether the potential benefits to the student or College outweigh the risks identified. This process should enable collaborative activities to be approved, monitored and managed effectively.

2.12 KPIs should be established to measure the success of the partnership arrangement. It is expected that as a minimum this should consider numbers of participating students and student evaluation processes and these will be reviewed as part of the monitoring and review arrangements.

2.13 An appropriate mechanism should be established for continuous monitoring of the arrangement, this should include a review of risks associated with the arrangement as well as considering information submitted as part of the College’s procedures for monitoring and review. The expectation is that feedback from the Partner will be included in PEP process and the fuller review of activity that is undertaken prior to the renewal of the agreement, with any outcomes from these processes shared with the Partner.

3. **Duration of the Agreement**

3.1 Agreements must be time-limited according to the level of risk attached to the activity and reviewed for re-signing at a maximum time interval of normally every five calendar years or duration of first programme cohort for the Memorandum of Agreement. Subject to the terms of the related Memorandum of Agreement, the start date and duration of the Schedule should reflect the number of academic years, starting with the first cohort (month and year) in which cohorts of students can be accepted onto the programme with reference to the College policy on term dates, duration of programme and entry points. For example, if the principal agreement starts in June 2018 and expires in June 2023, the first cohort of students accepted onto a three year programme would be September 2018 and the last intake would be September 2022, with an expected end date of June 2025. New intakes of students should not be registered on the programme beyond the expiry date except in cases where this is covered under the terms of agreement for operational reasons or where the agreement has been extended to cover the new intake prior to renewal of the agreement. In such cases this should be clearly referenced in the Agreement.

4. **Operation of Collaborative Provision**

4.1 When an activity is in the process of being established and prior to commencement a full dialogue should take place to ensure that the contribution of each partner to the development and content of the activity and its operation are fully agreed and articulated in the Memorandum of Agreement and accompanying Activity Schedule. The operational aspects should take into account the student lifecycle and consider how the arrangement will be marketed to students. It follows that the details will be proportionate to the nature of the activity and risks identified.

4.2 To support this process a representative from King’s and the partner(s) should be nominated to act as the key contact points for the shared activity, with one partner designated as the lead administrator to act as the main liaison between the partner(s). The role of each administrator is to oversee the implementation and ongoing delivery of the collaboration ensuring that the quality and standards of any awards are maintained. The
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role of the lead administrator is to ensure that any issues arising from the arrangement or outcomes from joint committee meetings are reported to all parties concerned, including acting as Chair (Academic Lead) or Secretary (Professional Services lead) for an established joint academic or programme management committee.

5. Marketing and publicity
5.1 All activity entered into must be consistent with the policies and strategies developed by King’s Marketing department. Consideration should be given to how the activity will be marketed and publicised by all parties, ensuring that information provided does not mislead on the nature of the partnership, provides accurate and clear information to students on the programme arrangements (including nature of award, PSRB) and does not damage the reputation of the College. Advice should be sought from the relevant faculty marketing team on how the activity will be publicised and monitored for accuracy.

6. Recruitment and admissions
6.1 The delegation for responsibility of admissions normally rests with the lead (home) institution, although responsibility may be shared for joint and dual award activity. Admissions processes should take account of both partners’ criteria, regulations and policy requirements including PSRB, recognition of prior learning and minimum entry requirements. The minimum and maximum number of students that can be recruited for the activity engaged in must be clearly stated including the arrangements for targeting and recruitment of students and the application process. For articulation arrangements, consideration should be given to how the Partner programme maps to the programme offered by the College to ensure that admissions criteria is equivalent to that normally expected for entry to the programme and the students have acquired the necessary skills to successfully complete their programme of study. Advice should be sought from the College’s Admissions Office on any special requirements or variations to the normal College admissions process.

7. Enrolment and registration
7.1 Consideration should be given to student enrolment and registration issues at the College and partner institution(s) taking into account student status and mode of attendance, duration of a jointly delivered programme, entry points, and UKVI visa compliance requirements. All students undertaking a programme at King’s are invited to enrol online and would normally be expected to attend the College’s campus registration event in person. Registered students are issued with a Kings email address and password and where appropriate a College card to enable them to access College facilities. Advice should be sought from the Admissions & Registry Services team and if appropriate the Visa Compliance team for visa and immigration issues and expectations for monitoring student attendance when off campus.

8. Student records
8.1 Consideration should be given to how students’ progress through the programme, including changes in registration status. Their formal relationship with the College should be clearly defined, particularly where procedures or reporting data in statistical returns (e.g. Unistats) differ amongst partners. Partnership arrangements should incorporate explicit requirements for the timely capture and communication of student activity from initial commencement to completion. Any collaboration across modules should be quantified to reflect the proportion of the module taught by each institution. Advice should be sought from the Planning and Student Analytics team to ensure that data will be reflected appropriately in College returns and takes into account any requirements from HESA or the Office for Students.
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9. **Student support**
9.1 Appropriate support mechanisms (academic, administrative and pastoral) must be in place with the Partner and communicated to students to enable them to engage effectively with their studies and seek address for any concerns. Students enrolled on a programme delivered in collaboration with a partner should receive comparable support to those students studying on College-delivered programmes including access to support facilities including induction arrangements, integration into the programme, distribution of student handbooks and programme/course material, accommodation and funding issues.

10. **Teaching or supervision arrangements**
10.1 The teaching contribution of each partner should be specified in the schedule, with the content and availability of modules agreed between the partners to ensure that the relevant learning aims and outcomes of the programme are met, including opportunities for transferable skills. Appropriate support should be agreed at the outset for arrangements involving the supervision of students on research projects or placement opportunities to ensure that opportunities are safe, supported and enable reasonable adjustments to be made. Consideration should also be given to the language of instruction at the Partner where English is not the Partner’s language of choice. Information of teaching and supervision arrangements should be included in the student handbook and course material.

11. **Assessment arrangements**
11.1 Assessment processes and procedures of partner organisations should be consistent with the College’s Academic regulations, although each partner will be responsible for the assessment regulations pertaining to their own modules, including transfer of marks or credit. It is expected that the language of instruction and assessment will normally be in English at the partner institution, except for language degrees (where appropriate).

11.2 Where marks assessed by a partner count towards the final classification of a King’s degree, a mapping of the marking criteria will require approval from the College Assessment Standards Committee¹, unless there is no variation in practice between King’s and the partner institution.

11.3 Consideration should also be given to any re-assessment opportunities and condonable fails, particularly around timing of boards for ratifying marks where this may impact on progression of final award, particularly where an unsuccessful outcome at the first attempt impacts on the Partner programme for progression and final award.

11.4 In cases where staff from an ‘off-site’ provider are involved in the assessment of students, such staff may be eligible to be members of the relevant assessment sub board, subject to the prior approval of the Chair of the College Assessment and Standards Committee. In the case of jointly delivered or awarded programmes all parties must be consulted when determining the final results for a student. Where a designated member of staff from the partner institute is unable to attend the assessment sub-board in person, joint decisions on assessment should be reported to the relevant sub-assessment board and included in the minutes for that meeting.

12. **External Examiner arrangements**
12.1 The appointment, induction and role of external examiners should be consistent with the College’s practice and UK standards. In the case of jointly delivered or awarded programmes, the external examiner must have an understanding of the UK HE system and be provided with guidance on the Partner system where this differs from the UK system.

¹ See Guidance on ‘Translation of credits/marks attained through study away from the College’ on page 286 of the Quality Assurance Handbook.
The external examiner appointed by the College is expected to have an oversight of all the components of assessment completed for the programme where this leads to a King’s award, either singly or jointly, with an outcomes arising from the assessment process being shared between the partners. This may include arranging with the Partner to allow the external examiner to have full access or enable a sampling of examination scripts. Advice should be sought from the QSE Office on external examiner arrangements and responsibilities.

13. Conferment of Award

13.1 The College’s classification scheme will apply for all programmes solely awarded by the College. Where a collaborative provision activity involves a joint award, agreement should be sought between the partners on the regulations that apply for the conferment of the final award ensuring that the student is able to meet the minimum award requirements of the College and partner institution(s), including consideration of the College’s policy on exit awards. Where there is a variation in the classification standards applied by King’s and the Partner in conferring the final award approval for the classification scheme will be required from the Chair of the College Assessment and Standards Committee.

14. Records of Study, Certificates and Graduation

14.1 Agreement should be sought between the partners for the routine issuing of marks, including the content and distribution of records agreed results/transcripts/HEAR and the final degree certificate for awards once results have been ratified, taking into account GDPR legislation. The formal records of study (record of agreed results/transcripts/HEAR) provided to students should make it clear at which higher education provider the different parts of the programme were studied. The College’s preferred position is that each partner will be responsible for producing a transcript of results for the student for any period of learning they are directly responsible for.

14.2 Information stated on the certificate or record of study should not omit any information necessary to providing a full understanding of the student achievement, including where the language of instruction was not English. Reference to the information that should be included on a certificate for a specific activity is noted in the College’s ‘Definitions of collaborative activity’. In the case of jointly delivered programmes the College has templates in place that can be shared with a Partner. These are available on request from the Examinations and Awards Office.

14.3 Students will automatically be invited to the graduation ceremony where King’s is solely or jointly responsible for awarding the degree. For Joint award arrangements, students may also be given the option of attending the Partner’s graduation ceremony.

15. Student Conduct and Appeals arrangements

15.1 It is expected that for local issues relating to student conduct and appeals these will be governed by the regulations of the Party concerned and is expected to follow the OIA guidance set out in the ‘Good Practice Framework: Delivering learning opportunities with others’ that notes the following: “Some providers will be delivering learning opportunities with others. Providers and their collaborative partners should make sure procedures properly signpost students to our Scheme and follow the guidance set out in the Good Practice Framework: Delivering learning opportunities with others. The procedures should clearly set out whether, when, and how the student can take their complaint/appeal etc to an awarding partner.”. Outcomes of any student conduct and appeals processes must be communicated to all parties concerned to meet the expectations of UK OIA requirements in respect of the ‘completion of procedures’ letter issued to students by the College. Advice should be
sought from the Student Conduct and Appeals Office on any issues relating to student conduct and appeals.

16. **Quality assurance and Management processes**

16.1 The responsibility for the student learning experience and the academic standards for King’s awarded degrees rests with the College, and the College’s quality assurance procedures will apply with formal approval and review through the College’s programme and module approval and review processes. Consideration should be given to how arrangements are jointly managed to meet the expectations of the College and the Partner, particularly where the programme also leads to the award of a qualification made jointly with or separately by the Partner.

16.2 All parties should identify and agree the relevant resources required to deliver the elements of the programme for which they are responsible. Arrangements for all students undertaking collaborative activity will be managed by the designated ‘home’ department, with students being offered the same opportunity to provide feedback on the element of their programme delivered off-site as for their locally taught modules.

16.3 Effective lines of communication should be established with the partner, including opportunities for site visits, to enable the effective management of the arrangement. For jointly delivered or jointly awarded programmes this includes establishing a Programme Management Committee to oversee the operational arrangements for the activity.

17. **Monitoring arrangements**

17.1 Faculty Education Committees (or equivalent) should monitor the operation of collaborative activity and report on such activity in their PEP reports to the College Assessment and Standards Committee as set out in the ‘Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review’.

17.2 For activity involving jointly delivered or jointly awarded taught degree programmes or validated provision regularly meetings should take place in accordance with the additional monitoring requirements set out in stage four of the ‘Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision’ to oversee the arrangements for the ongoing monitoring of the programme with representation from the partner institution. In cases where logistics might make attendance at meetings difficult there should be formally recorded mechanisms for the exchange of information.

17.3 A review of activity must be undertaken as set out in stage four of the ‘Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision’ before the agreement can be renewed or terminated, relevant programme documentation and a risk review should be included as part of this process.

17.4 A modification form should be submitted via OPAMA if a programme needs to be modified, suspended or terminated as a result of any changes to the partnership arrangements.

18. **Termination of the Agreement**

18.1 A transition plan should be put in place by the obligated parties on the arrangements for continuing students where both parties have agreed to terminate the agreement and suspend or withdraw a programme of study before or at the stated expiry date. Consideration should be given to the timeframe for students having the opportunity to complete the programme, arrangements for teaching out the programme taking into
account student expectations, financial arrangements including reporting requirements and the future relationship with the Partner.

19. **Financial arrangements**

19.1 Fee income costs should be agreed between the partners, with tuition fee and the Office for Students funding arrangements appropriately reflected. Contact details and annual review processes for overseeing the financial arrangements should be included, with a copy of the Business plan attached as a separate appendix to the Memorandum of Agreement. Where an invoice is payable under an agreement, it is expected that all valid invoices will be settled within 30 days of submission. Advice should be sought from the relevant Senior Finance Business Partner prior to final sign-off of the financial arrangements.
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1. Introduction
1.1 This guidance takes into account the chapter of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education that includes work-based and placement learning. The guidance is applicable for programmes where students undertake any College activity defined as placement learning where the College retains some responsibility for the student. Such activity may be a compulsory or voluntary part of a programme and may or may not be assessed as part of the final award for the programme. These guidelines also cover those circumstances where students have arranged their own placement with a placement provider with the approval of the College as part of an academic programme.

2. Definition of placement
2.1 For the purposes of this guidance, a student placement is a partnership arrangement whereby an external provider delivers a planned period of experience in a work based environment external to King’s (including those in industry, teacher education, healthcare professions, internships) enabling students to develop particular skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to achieving the relevant learning outcomes and/or the award of credit for a module or programme of study leading to a King’s award.

2.2 Types of Placement activity in operation at the College that are covered by this guidance include the following:
   - **Practice Placement/ Clinical Placement**: the opportunity provided contributes to the learning leading to professional qualifications for which they have a statutory or regulatory responsibility (includes clinical practice, clinical attachment, medical elective);
   - **Professional Placement/ non-Clinical Placement**: the opportunity provided contributes to the learning leading to professional qualifications in a non-clinical environment for which they have a statutory or regulatory responsibility (teacher education, legal practice);
   - **Work-based Placement**: the opportunity provided contributes to the learning specifically designed to lead to accreditation to a professional body for which there is no statutory or regulatory responsibility;
   - **Industrial Placement**: a planned period of experience with an organisation whose purpose is not primarily education enabling students the opportunity to contribute to their learning by applying knowledge from their degree in a non-academic environment (research undertaken in a laboratory);
   - **Internship Placement**: a planned period of experience to help students develop particular skills, knowledge and understanding (e.g. the accredited internship programme)

3. Quality assurance
3.1 Placements are not restricted to, but most typically take place in locations other than College premises, which would be the normal location of study for the student. Placement involves the engagement, support and co-operation of a placement learning provider such as an internship host organisation.

3.2 The College is responsible for adhering to any formal, legal and ethical considerations concerning placements within the UK or abroad. Departments/divisions must make every effort to evaluate individual placement opportunities and practices against a strict internal and external quality assurance process checklist before making available to students. This includes validating each placement closely against relevant government and College policy to help ensure that any student placement is valuable, measurable, safe, non-exploitative,
and as closely aligned to a path of academic study and personal/professional career development as possible.

3.3. The key principles of good practice underpinning placement provision are as follows:
➢ Placement Agreements;
➢ Programme design including arrangements for partner involvement;
➢ Delivery of provision including arrangements for selection and allocation of students to the placement, link tutor support; peer observation, supportive learning and student feedback and evaluation;
➢ Assessment;
➢ Responsibilities, roles and obligations of King’s, the partner and the student including training and guidance given;
➢ Duty of Care relating to legal, moral and ethical obligations to ensure the safety and well-being of students including mechanisms in place to ensure that opportunities are inclusive, safe, supported and reasonable adjustments are made when required.

4. Placement Agreements

4.1 All placement activity should be underpinned by a written agreement setting out the responsibilities, roles and obligations of each party in the arrangement.

4.2. The agreement setting out the terms and conditions of the placement opportunity should be signed by the student, the placement provider and the appropriate College authority at the local level e.g. a Head of Department or Executive Dean of Faculty.

4.3 Where the placement activity is with a partner organisation for a cohort of students completing the programme or as part of a study abroad exchange programme, a Memorandum of Agreement incorporating an activity schedule should be put in place in the first instance, unless such matters are covered as part of a major contract for placement provision e.g. NHS contracts. Please contact the QSE Office for advice on the procedures to follow.

4.4 Where the placement activity is for individual students undertaking an internship through the ‘Accredited Internships Programme’, organised centrally by the Careers and Employability Office. The College has a specific Placement Agreement template form for this purpose that can be accessed via the KEATS page. Further information on the process can be requested from the Careers and Employability Office. This template form can be used as a reference point or adapted for use at the local level as required, and advice should be sought from the QSE Office.

4.5 Where the placement opportunity is offered as part of a student exchange global mobility arrangement you should consult directly with the Global Mobility Office on the process to follow.

5. Programme design

5.1 The rationale for a placement should be clear and considered during programme design, approval and monitoring as part of normal quality assurance procedures.

5.2 The aims, objectives and appropriate learning outcomes for the placement should be clearly defined and agreed upon.

5.3 The department/division should consider the equity of opportunity for learning in the work/practice arena.
5.4 The benefits of placements over and above those related directly to the discipline should be identified.

5.5 The partner organisation should be involved at the outset in the arrangements for the placement provision.

6. Delivery of provision

6.1 Any process of selection or allocation of students to placements should be clear and transparent and notified to all students.

6.3 A link tutor should be allocated to liaise between the College, the student and the mentor from the placement organisation. Arrangements should be in place to also allow for peer observation and supportive learning.

6.4 The placement arrangement should provide students with the opportunity for peer observation to gain, develop or apply any key transferable and cognitive/intellectual skills.

6.5 Training should be provided for staff involved in placement learning so that staff are qualified, resourced and competent in their understanding of student needs, and so they are able to fulfil the relevant requirements of their roles and fully support the student learning.

6.5 As part of the monitoring and evaluation of internship placement rationale, organisation and practice, departments/divisions should use feedback from students and placement providers to make appropriate changes and improvements to quality and best practice. The information gathered should be included in Programme Enhancement Plan for Taught programmes or the annual monitoring form for research degree programmes.

7. Assessment of the placement

7.1 The appropriateness of the assessment for placement learning should be considered during programme design, approval and monitoring as part of normal quality assurance procedures and best practice. Assessment models must aim to measure a student’s use of critical reflection and application of key learned concepts and theories to the experiential working environment such as that of a placement.

7.2 Recognition of study or award of credit may count for credit only or as a numerical mark towards the final award with the credit level and value reflecting the length of time of the period of learning undertaken to achieve the relevant learning outcomes for the module or a programme of study.

7.3 The department/division should undertake an assessment of the health and safety aspects of the placement provision in consultation with the College’s Health and Safety Office and the placement provider. A guide to risk profiling and risk reducing actions adapted from UCEA Health and Safety Guidance for the placement of Higher Education Students should be used as a guide for factors that may affect a student undertaking a placement activity.

7.4 There should be a clear understanding of the assessment requirements and criteria between students and academic representatives and students must be appropriately prepared for the assessment.

7.5 Placement assessment in most circumstances is the responsibility of academic and/or other representatives of the College. In the case of placement providers being involved in assessment, they must be fully prepared for their role by the department/division.
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7.6 Where placements are a compulsory/formal requirement or standard component of the programme, ways to ensure the specified learning opportunities are available to all students must be considered.

7.7 Where an internship module, offered through the ‘Accredited Internships Programme’, is taken and assessed as part of a degree programme this is subject to the normal module approval process.

8. **Roles, responsibilities and requirements of the department/division**

8.1 There should be clear written information and guidelines on the placement in the form of a written agreement for any form of work-based learning being undertaken by a student as part of a programme of study, such as an accredited internship or industrial placement, a formal written agreement must be completed to confirm the placement.

8.2 The department/division should use this agreement to clearly outline all terms and conditions of the placement. The academic and pastoral services that are provided to students whilst on placement must also be clearly outlined and communicated and disseminated to providers and students.

8.3 The final agreement must be signed by both the placement provider/ host organisation and the student and electronic copies kept by each party.

8.4 Agreements from other institutions must be verified for accuracy and all forms of legal, moral and ethical compliance by the department/division. Any external agreement not provided or developed exclusively by the College can only be signed by a representative in possession of full legally-binding authority.

8.5 The department/division should maintain effective channels of communication with students and placement providers about the placement at all times as part of effective monitoring and evaluation.

8.6 There should be at least one identified point of contact at King’s for students whilst they are away on placement. There should also be an identified point of contact at the placement provider or host organisation for students whilst they are on placement.

8.7 There should be an identified point of contact at King’s for the placement provider or host organisation.

8.8 Records of adequate legal, financial and health and safety compliance should be documented and records kept of any applicable cover.

8.9 In some circumstances such matters may be covered as part of a major contract for clinical placements, for example within the Faculties of Life Sciences and Medicine and Nursing and Midwifery. This may include an exchange of confirmation via letter, email or memorandum of understanding as appropriate to the nature of the placement.

9. **Roles, responsibilities and requirements of the placement provider**

9.1 All information concerning roles, responsibilities and requirements of a placement provider or host organisation should be explicit, clear and available in written format.

9.2 Placement providers must provide the opportunity for the student to gain demonstrable skills and knowledge which adequately match the learning outcomes of their programme of academic study.
9.3 Placement providers must contribute to completion of a formal written agreement which outlines the full terms and conditions of a placement, including mutual aims and objectives and student duties and responsibilities and display acceptance/understanding of relevant College policy.

9.4 Placement providers must be able to demonstrate possession of their own policy, procedure and best practice in support of all legal, moral and ethical obligations relevant to a placement. This includes being able to provide evidence of adequate and appropriate health and safety and risk management procedures, insurance, and adherence to equality and diversity legislation relevant to placements. Copies of evidence must be available to both students and the department/division.

9.5 Providers must engage and communicate with both the student and department/division throughout the entire duration of the placement, providing updates on progress or issues as requested. Providers must also provide the opportunity for the student to feedback after completion of the placement.

10. Roles, responsibilities and requirements of the student

10.1 Students should ensure they have a full understanding of the learning opportunity being delivered and expectations for completing the opportunity. In this respect, all information concerning roles, responsibilities and requirements of a student should be explicit, clear and available in written format.

10.2 Students should consult regularly with their department/division to prepare themselves adequately for the placement and ensure that they are aware of ethical and health and safety issues or other issues relevant to the placement.

10.3 As a representative of the College, students must take responsibility for meeting the norms and expectations for professional conduct in the particular field of work that they are undertaking.

10.4 Students should maintain consistent and effective communication about the placement with their department and placement provider and provide feedback on any issues to their department/division as requested.

11. Duty of Care

11.1 It is important to note that the College’s legal, moral and ethical obligations relevant to items such as risk management, health and safety, insurance and equality and diversity legislation apply to students on placement to ensure their safety and well-being under Duty of Care.

11.2 The duty of the College is to take such care as is required in all circumstances to see that students do not meet foreseeable harm (i.e. to their health, safety and wellbeing) by making reasonable efforts in a reasonably competent way to try and fulfil this duty.

11.3 Whilst the College has an obligation to exercise a level of care to all students under Duty of Care, it is ultimately the responsibility of the student to verify the accuracy of information and requirements regarding placements from the relevant destination country, prior to undertaking a placement abroad. The College must show due diligence and full consideration of the relevant regulations and policy of the host country in which a student is completing a placement.

11.4 An assessment of the risks should be carried out prior to the student undertaking the placement opportunity. It is the responsibility of the placement organisation to manage risks in the workplace and ensure that the student is fully aware of these. To facilitate this process the placement organisation should complete the College’s ‘Placement and Internship Health
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and Safety Checklist’ form (F100-02-HSEPO) as part of this process. The Faculty should assess the risks and it is recommended that the College’s ‘General Risk Filter Assessment’ form (F071-01-HSEPO) is used for this purpose. The procedures for ‘Safety Risk Assessment in King’s College London’ can be located at: https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/about/ps/safety/sm/procedures/spr025.pdf

11.5 The department is responsible for ensuring that the organisation hosting the placement provides confirmation that they have adequate insurance in place to cover the student prior to approving the student participation in the placement opportunity. The Placement provider is expected to provide confirmation that the student will be covered by their public liability/ employers’ liability policy up to a limit of at least £5M and that such policies are current. It is the student’s responsibility to ensure they have adequate insurance cover in place to meet their personal needs in addition to any cover provided as part of a placement activity taking place in a Country outside the UK. The College has a standard travel insurance policy in place for students travelling abroad in connection with their studies.

11.6 All students should be provided with an equal opportunity for completing the placement to benefit from the learning it provides. This includes putting appropriate mechanisms in place that ensure that opportunities provided are inclusive, safe, supported and reasonable adjustments can be made when required.

11.7 Furthermore in relation to students with a disability, the legislation stipulates that in cases where the College arranges for a third party to provide education, training or other related services for students on its behalf, this provision remains the responsibility of the College and so is covered by the legislation. This means ensuring that a placement provider has systems in place to address and respond to specific need.

11.8 For any student completing a placement or participating in any form of work-based learning outside of their home country such as through Erasmus or language programmes will have different visa restrictions concerning the number of weekly hours that they can participate, the length and timing of the placement, and the acceptance of paid employment.

11.9 The Global Mobility Office provides guidance on international partnership arrangements and the Careers and Employability Office provide support and guidance to students who are pursuing internship opportunities, both in the UK and abroad and for staff. Regularly updated advice and guidance is also available through the Student Advice and International Student Support team.
Definitions of collaborative activity

The following definitions are used to describe the provision of all collaborative activity in operation at the College where the management of the educational opportunity for a programme of study or a module that leads to or contributes to the award of King’s academic credit or a qualification are delivered, assessed or supported through an arrangement with a Partner and where the achievement of the relevant learning outcomes for the programme or module is dependent on the arrangement made with the partner.

**Memorandum of Understanding (MoU):** a non-legally binding document setting out the aspirations between the Partners for future academic co-operation that is signed prior to any collaborative activity being agreed.

**Memorandum of Agreement (MoA):** a legally-binding document setting out the agreed terms of reference between the Partners for delivering any activity set out in the activity schedule that is signed prior to any agreed collaborative activity being delivered.

**Activity Schedule:** sets out the operational aspects for delivering the programme activity around the student lifecycle that is signed following programme approval. The activity schedule is not in itself legally-binding unless the accompanying MoA is signed.

**Jointly delivered programme activity:** defined by the QAA as ‘A programme delivered or provided jointly by two or more organisations, irrespective of the award (whether single, joint, dual/double or multiple). It refers to the education provided rather than the nature of the award’. Examples of types of jointly delivered programme activity are given in table one.

**Learning opportunity offered for a programme:** defined by the QAA as ‘The provision made for student’s learning, including planned study programmes, teaching, assessment, academic and personal support, and resources (such as libraries and information systems, laboratories, studios or specialist facilities)’. Examples of types of learning opportunities offered for a programme are given in table two.

**Serial Arrangements:** defined by the QAA as ‘the delivery organisation (through an arrangement of its own) offers whole programmes (franchised to it or validated by the degree awarding body) elsewhere or assigns to another party powers delegated to it by the degree awarding body’. Examples of types of Serial Arrangements are given in table three.

**Physically present overseas campus arrangements:** a generic description of those types of arrangement where the higher education provision of a UK degree-awarding body is delivered in a Country outside of the UK and is a typical example of a Transnational Education (TNE) arrangement. Examples of types of Physically present overseas campus arrangements are given in table four.
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**Table One (Jointly delivered programme activity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Co-operative partnership</th>
<th>Double or Multiple Awards</th>
<th>Dual Award</th>
<th>Joint Award</th>
<th>Split-site PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>An arrangement whereby the College enters into a partnership with another degree awarding body to design and jointly deliver a programme of study, but with only one awarding institution.</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby the College and one or more partner(s) provide a single jointly delivered programme for the same qualification, but leading to separate awards and separate certification being granted by both King’s and the Partner(s).</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby the College and another Partner work together to offer a jointly conceived programme leading to separate awards (and separate certification) being granted by both King’s and the Partner.</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement under which the College and one or more partner(s) provide a programme leading to a single award made jointly by King’s and the Partner(s). A single certificate or document (signed by the competent authorities) attests to the successful completion of this jointly delivered programme, replacing the separate institutional or national qualifications.</td>
<td>An arrangement whereby the College enters into a partnership with another institution for a ‘non-resident student’ to register for a King’s awarded PhD programme and receive joint supervision and access to shared resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Design</td>
<td>• A single jointly conceived programme with one distinct set of learning aims and outcomes; • The partner is expected to collaborate with the College to share resources and contribute to the teaching of the programme leading to a King’s award. The level of teaching contribution is normally continuous throughout the programme and significantly higher than for off-campus arrangements. These arrangements are</td>
<td>• A single programme with one set of learning aims and outcomes, designed and delivered in the same way as a Joint Award, but separate awards; • There is normally shared ownership of the curriculum and related IPR (Intellectual Property Rights); • These arrangements offer students a unique experience in being able to obtain two degree awards, although students have to satisfy the programme.</td>
<td>• Two programmes combined to form an integrated jointly conceived programme offered by King’s and the Partner with their own set of learning aims and outcomes; • These arrangements are designed to lock together with either overlapping curricula or comprising a joint initial curriculum (or two parallel and equivalent curricula) followed by two separate blocks of learning taken consecutively at each partner in turn;</td>
<td>• A single programme with one set of learning aims and outcomes leading to a single award; • There is normally shared ownership of the curriculum and related IPR (Intellectual Property Rights); • The programme offers students a unique experience; • These arrangements will only be considered were the Partner has the legal and regulatory authority to make the joint award and recognise this within their jurisdiction.</td>
<td>• A single jointly conceived programme with one distinct set of learning aims and outcomes; • The Partner is normally a Public Research Institution, Industrial Research Laboratory or a HEI without degree awarding powers or other government body that is prepared to host the student and deliver the training, resources and/or supervision to the standard expected by the College; • The arrangement allows for students to spend...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definitions of collaborative activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Co-operative partnership</th>
<th>Double or Multiple Awards</th>
<th>Dual Award</th>
<th>Joint Award</th>
<th>Split-site PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>normally only considered with a Partner where the College does not have the relevant expertise; The provision is jointly designed with the partner with elements of the programme being delivered and often assessed by the partner in accordance with the College policies and regulations.</td>
<td>requirements to receive any award; These arrangements will only be considered where there are legal or regulatory difficulties with the recognition or acceptance of a single joint certificate for a Joint Award e.g. due to Country specific government regulations, meaning that it is not in the interests of the students to mark their achievement in this way.</td>
<td>The overall programme offers a unique experience enabling students to achieve more than one set of learning aims and outcomes and complete the two programmes in a shorter timeframe. The programmes offered may be at different levels. Neither are dependent on the other and students may be able to successfully complete the learning aims and outcomes of one of the programmes to receive the intended qualification for that programme.</td>
<td>• There is a joint assessment process reporting into the relevant structure at both/all institutions;</td>
<td>significant periods of time with the Partner, where the prescribed programme of study shall be carried out under the primary supervision of an external supervisor at the institution or laboratory where the student will be based; The programme offers students the opportunity to acquire background knowledge and transferable skills relevant to their research; Only offered with Partners without degree-awarding powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>• There should be joint representation on relevant programme committees and assessment sub-boards to assure the academic standards and content for the programme, reporting into the King’s governance structure; Marks awarded under the Partner assessment regulations should be reported to the relevant Assessment Sub-Board.</td>
<td>• A Joint Programme Committee should be established to oversee and assure the academic standards and content for the programme, reporting into the relevant governance structure at both/all institutions;</td>
<td>• A Joint Programme Committee or JAC should be established to oversee and assure the academic standards and content for the overall programme, reporting into the relevant governance structure at both/all institutions;</td>
<td>• Arrangements for the considering the final results and qualification award of the student are jointly undertaken and</td>
<td>• There should be joint representation on the relevant JAC established to oversee and assure the academic standards and joint supervision arrangements, reporting into the King’s governance structure; The primary supervisor should play a key role in monitoring the progress of the student in liaison with the second supervisor based at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Co-operative partnership</th>
<th>Double or Multiple Awards</th>
<th>Dual Award</th>
<th>Joint Award</th>
<th>Split-site PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A mark translation scheme must be approved by CASC for the marks awarded by the Partner(s) that count towards the King’s award.</td>
<td>• consider the marks and/or credit that counts towards the King’s and Partner(s) programme;</td>
<td>• with the totality of the combined programmes having external examiner oversight; • Assessment marks and/or credit from each Partner may be used towards the award from the other Partner; • Where marks are used from the Partner towards the King’s classification award, a mark translation scheme must be approved by CASC.</td>
<td>• reported into the relevant structure at both/all institutions; • A mark translation scheme must be approved by CASC for the marks awarded by the Partner(s) that count towards the final joint award.</td>
<td>• King’s to enable the student to meet the key milestones for progress throughout their PhD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Award</td>
<td>Leads to a King’s award.</td>
<td>Leads to separate awards being granted by King’s and the Partner(s).</td>
<td>Leads to separate awards being granted by King’s and the Partner.</td>
<td>Leads to a single award made jointly by King’s and the other Partner(s).</td>
<td>Leads to a King’s award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>King’s certificate, although students may receive a separate transcript of results from the partner institution, and the final certificate awarded should recognise the contribution of the partner.</td>
<td>• Separate certificates issued by King’s and the Partner(s) attesting to the successful completion of the single programme; • The certificate should acknowledge that the programme has led to an equivalent qualification being awarded by the Partner as part of a double degree programme</td>
<td>• Separate certificates issued by King’s and the Partner, attesting to the successful completion of each of the programmes; • The certificate should acknowledge that the programme has led to the award of another qualification from the Partner as part of a dual degree programme</td>
<td>• A single certificate is jointly issued by King’s and the Partner(s), signed by the competent authorities, attesting to the successful completion of the jointly delivered/ supervised programme, replacing the separate institutional or national qualifications; • The single certificate may consist of two pages/sides jointly designed by the Parties</td>
<td>King’s certificate, although the final certificate awarded should recognise the contribution of the partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Co-operative partnership</td>
<td>Double or Multiple Awards</td>
<td>Dual Award</td>
<td>Joint Award</td>
<td>Split-site PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of collaborative activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to form the totality of the certificate. Care should be taken to ensure that the particulars stated on the two pages/sides match e.g. qualification awarded, date of award and must include a statement that it is only valid when presented with the other page/side of the single certificate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student entitlements
- King’s normal student entitlements. Students will also be given normal access to the Partner facilities to be able to successfully complete the elements of the programme delivered there.
- King’s and Partner normal student entitlements for the duration of the programme. Students will be considered ‘home’ students by both.
- King’s and Partner normal student entitlements for the duration of the respective programme of study delivered by each Party. Students will be considered ‘home’ students by both.
- King’s and Partner normal student entitlements for the duration of the programme, but with one of the Parties acting as the designated lead ‘home’ institution for administrative purposes.
- King’s normal student entitlements. Students will also be given normal access to the Partner facilities to be able to successfully complete the elements of the programme delivered there.

Responsibility for academic standards
- King’s where it owns the programme and is solely responsible for the final award.
- King’s and the Partner are responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of its own provision and making its own award.
- King’s and the Partner are responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of its own provision and making its own award.
- King’s and the Partner are equally responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of the award and make the award jointly.
- King’s where it owns the programme and is solely responsible for the final award.

Quality Assurance processes
- Subject to King’s quality assurance processes, although arrangements for undertaking this may be jointly managed with the Partner. Medium risk activity requires sign off from PDAC.
- Subject to all awarding institutions quality assurance processes, with all aspects of programme design, development, delivery, assessment, management and decision-making on
- Subject to both awarding institutions quality assurance processes, although there may be a pooling/sharing of resources;
- Subject to all awarding institutions quality assurance processes, with all aspects of programme design, development, delivery, assessment, management and decision-making on
- Subject to King’s quality assurance processes, although arrangements for undertaking this may be jointly managed with the Partner. Medium risk activity requires sign off from PDAC.
### Definitions of collaborative activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Co-operative partnership</th>
<th>Double or Multiple Awards</th>
<th>Dual Award</th>
<th>Joint Award</th>
<th>Split-site PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• External examiner oversight of marks obtained from modules taken at the Partner.</td>
<td>student achievement being jointly undertaken; • External examiner oversight for the totality of the programme.</td>
<td>• External examiner oversight for the totality of the programme.</td>
<td>student achievement being jointly undertaken; • External examiner oversight for the totality of the programme.</td>
<td>• Subject to the normal process for appointment of examiners and conduct of the examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations, policy and student related procedures</td>
<td>Governed by relevant sections of the College’s Academic Regulations, policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Governed by relevant sections of the College’s Academic Regulations, policies and procedures for the King’s award and by the Partner’s equivalent for their award. Although there may be a separate set of programme regulations established.</td>
<td>Governed by relevant sections of the College’s Academic Regulations, policies and procedures for the King’s award and by the Partner’s equivalent for their award. Although there may be a separate set of programme regulations established.</td>
<td>Governed by relevant sections of the College’s Academic Regulations, policies and procedures with any limitations required by the Partner in respect of the thesis being stated in the agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>• Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity; • Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes.</td>
<td>• Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity; • Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes.</td>
<td>• Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity; • Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes.</td>
<td>• Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity; • Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes; • Guidance on key principles relating to the management, monitoring and assessment of joint PhD programmes; • Core terms of reference for a Joint Academic Committee for joint PhD programmes.</td>
<td>• Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity; • Guidance on off-campus study in research degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>• QSE Office • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
<td>• QSE Office • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
<td>• QSE Office • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
<td>• QSE Office • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
<td>• Centre for Doctoral Studies (PhD programmes) • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Co-operative partnership</th>
<th>Double or Multiple Awards</th>
<th>Dual Award</th>
<th>Joint Award</th>
<th>Split-site PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Centre for Doctoral Studies (PhD programmes)</td>
<td>• Centre for Doctoral Studies (PhD programmes)</td>
<td>• QSE Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Agreement</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Low to Medium</td>
<td>Medium to High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association and monitoring of partner publicity and partner withdrawal;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association and monitoring of partner publicity;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association and monitoring of partner publicity;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association and monitoring of partner publicity and partner withdrawal;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association and monitoring of partner publicity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on student experience for integrating students when delivering programme across more than one campus, in particular different geographical locations and diverse cultures and quality of Partner provision;</td>
<td>• Impact on student experience for integrating students when delivering programme across more than one campus, in particular different geographical locations and diverse cultures and quality of Partner provision;</td>
<td>• Impact on student experience for integrating students when delivering programme across more than one campus, in particular different geographical locations and diverse cultures and quality of Partner provision;</td>
<td>• Impact on student experience for integrating students when delivering programme across more than one campus, in particular different geographical locations and diverse cultures and quality of Partner provision;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s and Partner requirements within their respective Quality Assurance framework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact of Partner withdrawal;</td>
<td>• Impact if breakdown in complex working relationship and programme withdrawn;</td>
<td>• Impact if breakdown in complex working relationship and programme withdrawn;</td>
<td>• Impact if breakdown in complex working relationship and programme withdrawn;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining consistency between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework;</td>
<td>• Impact on complying with College expectations where partner(s) Quality Assurance framework differs;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including complexities around King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards and the quality of the student experience;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards, including double counting and complexities around mark translation, and</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards and the quality of the student experience;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards and the quality of the student experience;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Co-operative partnership</td>
<td>Double or Multiple Awards</td>
<td>Dual Award</td>
<td>Joint Award</td>
<td>Split-site PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the quality of the student experience;</td>
<td>mark translation, and the quality of the student experience;</td>
<td>the quality of the student experience;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining consistency between regulations and policy for shared ownership of the Programme;</td>
<td>regulations and policy for shared ownership of the Programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining consistency between regulations and policy for shared ownership of the Programme and related IPR (Intellectual Property Rights);</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining consistency between regulations and policy for shared elements of the Programme;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining consistency between regulations and policy for shared ownership of the Programme and related IPR (Intellectual Property Rights);</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s legal compliance in respect of government requirements;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s legal compliance in respect of government requirements and impediments to the recognition of a joint award requiring a pooling together of degree awarding powers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on King’s legal compliance in respect of government requirements;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s legal compliance in respect of government requirements;</td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations;</td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations;</td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations;</td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations;</td>
<td>• Impact on ensuring sufficient resources are in place to protect the student experience.</td>
<td>• Impact on ensuring sufficient resources are in place to protect the student experience.</td>
<td>• Impact on ensuring sufficient resources are in place to protect the student experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on ensuring sufficient resources are in place to protect the student experience.</td>
<td>• Impact on delivering appropriate and suitable resources to deliver the overall programme and protect the student experience, resource heavy.</td>
<td>• Impact on delivering appropriate and suitable resources to deliver the overall programme and protect the student experience, resource heavy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table Two (Learning opportunity offered for a programme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Articulation/ Progression</th>
<th>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</th>
<th>Off-campus study</th>
<th>Placement provision</th>
<th>Student Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby cohorts of students who satisfy academic criteria on a programme offered by a Partner are automatically entitled to be considered for admission with advanced standing (with or without RPL) to a subsequent stage of the specified programme (Articulation) or whereby selected students, who have met the admissions criteria, may be granted entry from a programme of study offered by another institution/body to a specified programme of study at the College without advanced standing (Progression).</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby two or more awarding bodies collaborate in the delivery of studentships, and personal, professional and career development skills training for research candidates. Included within this definition are Doctoral Training Programmes where there is a collaborative element to provision e.g. LAHP Doctoral Training Partnership.</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby an external provider designs learning opportunities or provides specialist teaching and/or resources, which have demonstrated adherence to the appropriate quality requirements and academic standards leading to a King’s award and where the learning opportunity is delivered on the partner’s premises.</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby an external provider delivers a planned period of experience in a work-based environment, enabling students to develop particular skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to achieving the relevant learning outcomes of a programme of study leading to a King’s award.</td>
<td>A partnership arrangement whereby students are offered the opportunity to experience study overseas and enhance their degree. The strength of the partnership is expected to be both sustainable and reciprocal in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Design</td>
<td>• A flexible route that promotes student recruitment opportunities enabling students the opportunity to gain an overall learning experience and broaden their knowledge of a subject</td>
<td>• These arrangements are normally funded by Research Council studentships and may be used as a model of effective practice in providing research methods and skills training for research.</td>
<td>• The programme is designed by King’s and enables students to spend part of their programme at a Partner enabling access to specialist resources and/or supervision arrangements and/or</td>
<td>• The Placement provider may include other awarding bodies, other education providers, non-academic providers (or those whose purpose is not primarily education) and employers;</td>
<td>• The arrangement fosters mobility and training opportunities for students through a range of study abroad options, including the Erasmus + scheme and inter-institutional exchanges;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

90 A distinction is drawn between formal agreements with a Partner that secure automatic admission with advanced standing to a subsequent King’s awarded programme and individual students submitting a request as part of their admissions application.

91 Please refer to the College Policy on recognition of prior learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Articulation/ Progression</th>
<th>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</th>
<th>Off-campus study</th>
<th>Placement provision</th>
<th>Student Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>area in a shorter timeframe than if each programme was completed individually; The learning experience for each programme offered is paired together, either at the same level or at different levels to form two discrete awards, but is not conceived as a joint enterprise as would be the case for a Dual Award; King’s recognises the provision offered by the Partner as being suitable preparation for a student to either transfer onto a programme at King’s at an advanced stage (Articulation) or access a programme of study at King’s (Progression); Articulation arrangements will require a formal commitment as King’s will consider the student as a direct entrant with or without recognition of credit whereas Progression agreements are informal arrangements with no guarantee of acceptance</td>
<td>candidates and early career researchers; The training may be within a focused research area or in the context of a mutually beneficial research collaboration between academic or non-academic providers or a combination of both; The programme arrangements may involve the student undertaking a planned period of experience at the Partner or supervisory arrangements.</td>
<td>specialist teaching to enhance the student experience; The Partner is responsible for the provision of specialist resources and/or supervision arrangements and/or the design and delivery of the specialist teaching, and may be responsible for assessing modules, that is subject to approval by King’s to ensure it will meet the needs of the student learning experience and expectations.</td>
<td>Contributes to the learning leading to professional qualifications for which they have a statutory or regulatory responsibility (Practice Placement/ Clinical Placement e.g. medical electives and Professional Placement/non-Clinical e.g. teacher education) or a non-academic environment (Industrial Placements e.g. research undertaken in a laboratory) or a planned period of experience to help students develop particular skills, knowledge and understanding through a planned period of learning (Internships) or to specifically enable accreditation to a professional body that is not statutory or regulatory (work-based placement); Credit may be given as either credit transfer or award of credit for the planned period of study necessary to achieve the relevant learning</td>
<td>The opportunity offered involves a planned period of study or experience which contributes towards a King’s programme of study either as credit or mark transfer; The opportunity may be optional or compulsory to the student’s degree programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Articulation/ Progression</td>
<td>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</td>
<td>Off-campus study</td>
<td>Placement provision</td>
<td>Student Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onto a programme of study offered by King’s.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>• King’s and the Partner map the programme arrangement enabling students to transfer from one programme to the other or progress to the next stage of their learning; • King’s and the Partner own the curriculum for their own programme of study, although each may have an input into the curriculum content.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study.</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to provide the necessary resources and teaching to deliver the learning opportunity for the King’s programme of study; • Consideration should be given to the level of academic, administrative and pastoral support offered by the Partner and the strength of the relationship between participating departments for managing the activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Award</td>
<td>The student is awarded a degree from King’s and may receive an award from the Partner recognising any learning completed at King’s, but these types of arrangement do not lead to the award of academic credit of the College towards the Partner programme.</td>
<td>The student is awarded a degree from King’s only.</td>
<td>The student is awarded a degree from King’s only.</td>
<td>The student is awarded a degree from King’s only.</td>
<td>The student is awarded a degree from King’s only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>King’s will only issue a certificate for the programme offered by King’s and will not</td>
<td>King’s will only issue a certificate for the programme offered by King’s and will not</td>
<td>King’s will only issue a certificate for the programme offered by King’s and will not</td>
<td>King’s will only issue a certificate for the programme offered by King’s and will not</td>
<td>King’s will only issue a certificate for the programme offered by King’s and will not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Articulation/ Progression</th>
<th>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</th>
<th>Off-campus study</th>
<th>Placement provision</th>
<th>Student Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acknowledge on the certificate any association with the Partner</td>
<td>acknowledge on the certificate any association with the Partner</td>
<td>acknowledge on the certificate any association with the Partner</td>
<td>acknowledge on the certificate the association with the Partner</td>
<td>acknowledge on the certificate the association with the Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student entitlements</td>
<td>Students have normal entitlements whilst enrolled on the King’s award-bearing programme, but would have no student entitlements at King’s whilst they are enrolled on the programme offered by the Partner.</td>
<td>Students have normal King’s entitlements and may be granted entitlements by the Partner to enable them to successfully complete the elements of the programme delivered there.</td>
<td>Students have normal King’s entitlements and may be granted entitlements by the Partner to enable them to successfully complete the elements of the programme delivered there.</td>
<td>Students have normal King’s entitlements and may be granted entitlements by the Partner to enable them to successfully complete the elements of the programme delivered there.</td>
<td>Students have normal King’s entitlements and may be granted entitlements by the Partner to enable them to successfully complete the elements of the programme delivered there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for academic standards</td>
<td>King’s and the Partner are responsible for the delivery and quality of their own programme of study and academic standards of award. King’s is responsible for ensuring that the provision undertaken at the partner institution is suitable for the recognition of specified admissions criteria or recognition of credit for prior learning (RPL).</td>
<td>King’s has overall responsibility for the academic standards of award, although the Partner is responsible for the provision and must demonstrate adherence to the appropriate quality requirements and academic standards required.</td>
<td>King’s has overall responsibility for the academic standards of award, although the Partner is responsible for the provision and must demonstrate adherence to the appropriate quality requirements and academic standards required.</td>
<td>King’s has overall responsibility for the academic standards of award, although the Partner is responsible for the provision and must demonstrate adherence to the appropriate quality requirements and academic standards required.</td>
<td>King’s has overall responsibility for the academic standards of award, although the Partner is responsible for the provision and must demonstrate adherence to the appropriate quality requirements and academic standards required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance processes</td>
<td>The partner Institution owns the curriculum and the award for their particular programme of study and is responsible for its delivery and quality assurance, although there may be a sharing of resources agreed between the Parties.</td>
<td>King’s is the awarding institution and owns the programme, King’s has overall responsibility for quality assurance through the usual mechanisms.</td>
<td>King’s is the awarding institution and owns the programme, King’s has overall responsibility for quality assurance through the usual mechanisms.</td>
<td>King’s is the awarding institution and owns the programme, King’s has overall responsibility for quality assurance through the usual mechanisms.</td>
<td>King’s is the awarding institution and owns the programme, King’s has overall responsibility for quality assurance through the usual mechanisms, but the Partner will be responsible for the design and delivery of their own provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Agreement</th>
<th>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule (contact QSE for a modified template specific for these types of arrangement)</th>
<th>DTC collaboration or DTP partnering agreement</th>
<th>Memorandum of Agreement and Activity Schedule</th>
<th>Internship Host Agreement (can be adapted to suit the purpose), may be supported with a Service Level Agreement with the Partner</th>
<th>Student Exchange Agreement or Erasmus + agreement or Activity Schedule (where a MoA already exists with the Partner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Articulation/ Progression</strong></td>
<td><strong>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</strong></td>
<td><strong>Off-campus study</strong></td>
<td><strong>Placement provision</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Exchange</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations, policy and student related procedures</td>
<td>Governed by the relevant sections of the Academic Regulations and King’s policies and procedures; Short Course Policy</td>
<td>Governed by the relevant sections of the Academic Regulations and King’s policies and procedures; Core code of practice for postgraduate research degrees</td>
<td>Governed by the relevant sections of the Academic Regulations and King’s policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Governed by the relevant sections of the Academic Regulations and King’s policies and procedures.</td>
<td>Governed by the relevant sections of the Academic Regulations and King’s policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consult</strong></td>
<td>• QSE Office • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
<td>Head of Doctoral Training Centre Development</td>
<td>• QSE Office (taught programme provision) • Centre for Doctoral Studies (research degree provision) • Global Engagement Office (International Partners)</td>
<td>• Careers and Employability Office for Internship Host programme • Global Mobility Office for Languages and Literatures (taught programmes) • QSE Office (taught programmes) • Centre for Doctoral Studies (research degrees)</td>
<td>• Global Mobility Office • QSE Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low to medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definitions of collaborative activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Articulation/ Progression</th>
<th>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</th>
<th>Off-campus study</th>
<th>Placement provision</th>
<th>Student Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association and monitoring of partner publicity linking the programmes;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association with the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association with the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association with the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association with the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s reputation through association with the Partner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on student expectations for progression to King’s or Partner’s programme;</td>
<td>• Impact on quality of student experience and expectations for elements delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on quality of student experience and expectations for elements delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on student experience and expectations for elements delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of planned period of work-based learning;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of planned period of work-based learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on monitoring the quality of students completing the Partner programme;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of supervision and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of teaching and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of teaching and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of teaching and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on monitoring the Partner provision and student achievement;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of teaching and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s obligations in respect of government requirements for legal compliance;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of teaching and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on maintaining compliance with King’s Quality Assurance framework, including quality of teaching and availability of resources delivered by the Partner;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on ensuring and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards.</td>
<td>• Impact on King’s obligations in respect of government requirements for legal compliance;</td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations, including adequate insurance policies in place at the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on ensuring sufficient resources are in place to protect the student experience;</td>
<td>• Impact on financial standing of Partner and King’s business operations, including adequate insurance policies in place at the Partner;</td>
<td>• Impact on ensuring sufficient resources are in place to protect the student experience;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definitions of collaborative activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Articulation/ Progression</th>
<th>Doctoral Training Centres/ Partnerships</th>
<th>Off-campus study</th>
<th>Placement provision</th>
<th>Student Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in place to protect the student experience;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact of Partner withdrawal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>in place to protect the student experience;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact of Partner withdrawal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact of termination of the placement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact of Partner withdrawal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table Three (Serial arrangements)

King’s currently has only one such arrangement in place, namely the validation of programmes offered by RADA. King’s may enter into new validated provision arrangements with a UK Partner that is similarly subject to the UK Quality Code.

The College is unlikely to enter into arrangements for accredited or franchised provision due to the complexity of these types of arrangement and the devolved responsibility for quality assurance mechanisms where the College would only have limited control. Therefore, the definitions for accredited provision and franchised provision have been included for advisory purposes only.

| Accredited provision | A partnership arrangement whereby an institution without its own degree awarding powers is given wide authority by the College to exercise powers and responsibility for academic provision. The College will remain ultimately responsible for the quality and standard of its awards, but only exercises limited control over the quality assurance functions of the partner institution. |
| Franchised Provision: | A partnership arrangement under which a partner is authorised/licensed to provide the whole or part of a programme of study designed by the College and leading to an award or award of credit of the College. |
| Validated Provision: | A partnership arrangement whereby King’s judges that a programme of study developed and delivered by another organisation is of an appropriate quality and standard to lead to a King’s award and is subject to King’s quality assurance procedures. 

These types of arrangement are normally with a provider (without their own degree awarding powers) for specialist provision not offered by the College. The specialist education provided is designed and delivered by the delivery organisation enabling students to receive a King’s award that is recognised and trusted by future employers. The students will have a direct contractual relationship with the Partner and will not have a contractual relationship with King’s. Therefore, the students will not have any student entitlements at King’s.

Separate ‘Policy and procedures for validation and accreditation’ govern these types of arrangement.

Table Four (Physically present overseas campus arrangements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Flying Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition:</td>
<td>An arrangement whereby a programme is delivered in a location away from the main campus (usually in another country) by staff from the College, who also carry out all assessment. Support for students may be provided by local staff, but the programme is solely delivered by King’s leading to a King’s only award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Design:</td>
<td>The whole or major part of a King’s programme is delivered at Partner organisation by King’s staff, opening up the opportunity for students to gain a King’s experience away from the main College campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management:</td>
<td>King’s is responsible for managing the relationship with the Partner to ensure the necessary oversight for the provision of resources and teaching arrangements to deliver the King’s programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Award:</td>
<td>Leads to a King’s award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification:</td>
<td>Standard King’s certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student entitlements</td>
<td>Students have remote access to normal King’s entitlements and may also have entitlements to facilities at the Partner organisation to complete the elements of their programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Responsibility for academic standards: King’s is solely responsible for the academic standards of award.

Quality Assurance processes: King’s is the awarding institution and owns the programme. King’s has overall responsibility for quality assurance through the usual mechanisms, but there may be some input from the Partner who deliver the resources for the programme.

Regulations, policy and student related procedures: Governed by the relevant sections of the College’s Academic Regulations, policies and procedures.

Guidance: Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity

Consult
• Human Resources
• Finance Directorate
• Visa Compliance team
• QAS
• Global Engagement Office (International Partners)

Type of Agreement Memorandum of Agreement (incorporating operational arrangements for services provided and delivery of programme)

Risks Low to Medium
• Impact on King’s reputation through association with the Partner including protection of King’s brand, King’s obligations and Government advice;
• Impact on monitoring the quality of student experience and expectations where this is being managed by the Partner;
• Impact on maintaining and safeguarding academic standards of King’s awards where academic regulations and related policies are being implemented and student records maintained by the Partner or any teaching delivered, including compliance with UK QAA obligations, compatibility with Partner quality assurance obligations and any PSRB requirements;
• Impact on King’s in respect of government requirements for legal compliance, including data protection, accessibility, equality, right of appeal, freedom of speech, suitability of learning environment, employment law and tax issues that may impact on the delivery of the programme;
• Impact of in-country permissions or changes to operate King’s business in the Partner Country, including ease of obtaining permissions and adapting to changes, IP, financial and tax regulations for hiring staff and contacting with students, staff visas, implementation of the regulatory framework to accredit and deliver the programme in another Partner Country;
• Impact on management of human resources including employment and training/development of local staff, political situations posing potential risks to staff working in another Country, physical impact on staff working across different campuses, effective communication and maintaining good relations between staff and students based at different campuses and operating in a different cultural teaching environment;
• Impact on ensuring the Partner is able to provide appropriate resources and support levels to protect the student experience;
• Impact of Partner withdrawal.

Individual student activity

The following types of individual student activity may be attached to an ‘approved’ programme of study leading to a King’s award but does not fall under the Procedures for the approval, monitoring and management of collaborative provision for the following reasons:

➢ Student placement or internship opportunities: covered separately under the ‘Guidance on student placements’ once the programme approval process has been completed to allow for these types of opportunity to be undertaken.

➢ Research student opportunities: covered separately under the ‘Guidance on off-campus study in research degrees’ and approval and monitoring arrangements are set out in the ‘Regulations for research degrees’ and the ‘Core code of practice’.

➢ Intercollegiate module opportunities: fall under the governance structure of the University of London and arrangements for intercollegiate module registration and are covered separately in the College’s ‘Policy Statement on intercollegiate modules’. The only exception is where the programme is jointly
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delivered with the Partner leading to a King’s award in association with the Partner or the final qualification award is made jointly with the Partner.
Guidance on jointly delivered taught programmes

The following guidance has been written to assist those developing proposals for jointly delivered programme activity with a Partner. The policy draws on and is consistent with the QAA Quality Code to take into consideration a number of points.

1. Definition and key characteristics

1.1 Jointly delivered programmes are arrangements whereby the College and one or more awarding bodies share or pool resources to jointly provide or deliver a programme of study, irrespective of the award (whether single, joint, double/multiple or dual). It refers to the education provided rather than the nature of the award and are designed to enhance the student learning experience.

1.2 The following types of jointly delivered taught programme activity are covered by this guidance:

- **Co-operative partnership**, an arrangement whereby the College enters into a partnership with another degree awarding body to design and jointly deliver a programme of study, but with only one awarding institution.

- **Double or Multiple Award**, a partnership arrangement whereby the College and one or more partner(s) provide a single jointly delivered programme for the same qualification that leads to separate awards and separate certification being granted by both King’s and the Partner(s).

- **Dual Award**, a partnership arrangement whereby the College and another Partner work together to offer a jointly conceived programme leading to separate awards (and separate certification) being granted by both King’s and the Partner.

- **Joint Award**, a partnership arrangement under which the College and one or more partner(s) provide a programme leading to a single award made jointly by King’s and the Partner(s). A single certificate or document (signed by the competent authorities) attests to the successful completion of this jointly delivered programme, replacing the separate institutional or national qualifications.

1.3 The key characteristics defining each type of activity are set out in Table One of the College’s ‘Definitions of collaborative activity’.

1.4 Double, Multiple or Dual award collaborative arrangements will only be considered for approval where there are legal or regulatory impediments to issuing a joint award or it is not in the interests of the student to mark their achievement in this way. This is due to the possible consequences arising from each participating partner offering credit for the same pieces of work (double counting) and the necessity of ensuring that the completion of one programme may have resulted in the conferral of an additional award.

2. Principles underlying jointly delivered programmes

2.1 The partner(s) must be of equal status and enhance the reputation of the College and should fit with the goals of the College’s strategic plan including the College’s international strategy. Joint degrees will normally only be considered where there is a demonstrable strategic imperative.

2.2 The arrangement entered into must be fully compliant with King’s governance arrangements with Faculties being responsible for undertaking the detailed scrutiny of the proposal at the
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approval stage and overseeing the management and monitoring of the programme once it has been approved.

2.3 The arrangement entered into must be compliant with King’s policies and procedures and meet the requirements of the relevant academic regulations. Variations in practice should be considered and resolved at the outset.

2.4 The partner institution must be legally empowered through their relevant statutes and charters to enter into an arrangement with the College. Both parties will need to ensure that they are fully aware of any legal restrictions, and compliant with the laws of that country to be able to satisfy the academic standards of each degree awarding body, which cannot be shared amongst partners, ensuring that the standards of all jurisdictions are met. Where the arrangement is for a Joint Award, the partner institution must confirm that they have the legal capacity to pool their degree awarding powers with those of the College to make the joint award.

2.5 Partnership arrangements should be based on shared academic interests and complementary expertise and be organised between specific academic units in both institutions. Risk management strategies should be established with appropriate and proportionate safeguards put in place to manage the risks involved.

2.6 Proposals must undergo the appropriate due diligence processes, as indicated in the College’s Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision at Section C. This should be proportionate and relevant in nature and intensity to risks identified. The process should ensure the academic standing of the partner is satisfactory, financial and legal obligations have been met, staff are appropriately qualified to deliver those parts of the programme for which they are responsible and the appropriate resources are in place. The arrangements for access to learning resources should be clearly communicated to students.

2.7 The roles, responsibilities and obligations of each partner in respect of the jointly awarded programme(s), particularly the operational aspects around the student lifecycle, must be clearly set out in the Memorandum of Agreement and accompanying Activity Schedule, and where appropriate the programme and/or module specification.

2.8 The proposal should ensure that College is able to retain proper control of any aspects of the arrangement delegated to the Partner to safeguard the academic standards of the award from the College’s perspective.

2.9 Arrangements should be put in place to ensure that students are able to complete their programme of study and be granted the joint award in the event that one or other of the partners withdraws from the arrangement.

2.10 Arrangements must be recorded on the College’s register of activity as this will be made available publicly to interested parties.

2.11 The standards of award made by the College where the activity has been jointly delivered with the Partner must be maintained irrespective of any requirements of the Partner institution and should ensure parity with other awards conferred at the same level by the College, including ensuring consistency with any UK national requirements. Where the arrangement is for a Dual award, care should be taken that academic standards are not compromised by ensuring that credit awarded for transfer and accumulation purposes are not multiplied.
2.12 Where appropriate, the nature of the awards offered take into account any requirements set out in the College’s ‘Guidance on Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) reporting’.

2.13 It is expected that jointly designed or conceived programmes will offer students clear benefits that will add to their academic development and employability. The programme specification should be submitted in accordance with the College’s ‘Procedures for programme and module approval and modification’. Details should be provided on the learning delivered by the Partner as well as by the College. Where the Partner is providing specific modules or components for the programme, confirmation is sought of their approval process as part of due diligence enquiries. Details of the final awards made, particularly where this differs to the award made by the College, should also be stated in the programme specification. The arrangements for how the programme will operate around the student lifecycle should be clearly set out in the Activity Schedule that is considered as part of the approval process.

2.14 Partners should determine the division of responsibilities for the management of the admissions process and how these responsibilities are shared. The obligations of each partner should be communicated to students in their offer letter in accordance with CMA compliance. The ‘home’ institution for the student should be designated as the administrative lead for coordinating the operational aspects of delivering the programme.

2.15 Partners should determine the division of responsibilities relating to assessment and regulations and which requirements apply, any deviation from the College’s published regulations must be explicitly approved as part of the programme approval process. Mapping of the marking criteria for all marks assessed by a partner counting towards the classification of the final award will require approval from the Academic Standards Sub-Committee in accordance with the relevant Academic regulations.

2.16 The appointment, induction and role of the external examiners must be clearly defined at the outset and conform to the requirements of the College regulations. The external examiner is expected to have oversight of the totality of the programme and to comment on this in their report.

2.17 Arrangements should be put in place to ensure the effective monitoring and review of jointly delivered programmes. This includes the establishment of a Joint Programme Management Committee to oversee the programme. An annual report should be submitted for the programme as per the College ‘Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review’ at Section D. The partnership arrangements should be reviewed a minimum of six months prior to the expiry of the agreement and in conjunction with the College’s periodic review processes. Any proposed deviation from these expectations will need to be explicitly approved as part of the programme approval process.

2.18 The arrangements for marketing and publicising the programmes should be clearly defined to ensure the College has effective control over the accuracy of public information, publicity and promotional material and agreed between the parties at the outset. Each administrative lead for the programme will have designated responsibility for this purpose.

2.19 In the interests of transparency, the certificate and/or record of achievement should indicate whether the programme has been jointly awarded or leads to a double/ multiple, dual or single award. Care should be taken to ensure that the certificate of award is not issued until the student has fully completed their programme of study in accordance with all participating institutions regulatory framework. The expectations for each type of arrangement are set out in the table below:
Joint Degree Programme

A programme of study where the learning opportunity is delivered or provided jointly by two or more organisations leading to one of the following award options.

**Joint Award**
- A single award is conferred in the joint names of all the degree awarding bodies concerned;
- A single certificate is issued (on two pages/sides) to the student attesting to the successful completion of the joint degree programme;
- The single certificate issued is signed by all the competent authorities of the participating degree awarding bodies;
- Requires a pooling together of degree awarding powers and recognition under each Partner Country’s legal jurisdiction as both Parties are jointly responsible for the qualification award and issuing of the certificate which replaces the separate institutional or national qualifications.

**Double¹ Degree Award**
- Two separate awards that are dependent on the other being granted by each of the participating degree awarding bodies;
- Two certificates are issued to the student attesting to the successful completion of the joint degree programme;
- Each degree certificate must state that the programme has led to a double degree and an equivalent certificate being issued by the other party;
- Each party is responsible for their own qualification award and the issuing of their certificate to the student.

**Dual Award**
- Two separate awards that may not be dependent on the other being granted by each of the participating degree awarding bodies;
- Two certificates are issued to the student attesting to the successful completion of each qualification awarded within the overall programme;
- Each degree certificate must state that the programme has led to a dual degree and another award and certificate has been issued by the other party;
- Each party is responsible for their own qualification award and the issuing of their certificate to the student.

**Single Award**
- A single award by the home institution;
- A single certificate is issued by the home institution to the student attesting to the successful completion of the programme;
- The degree certificate must state that the programme has been delivered in association with the other party;
- Each party is responsible for their own qualification award and the issuing of the certificate to the student.

¹ Where more than one partner is awarding the qualification alongside King’s leading to a minimum of three separate qualifications this is referred to as a Multiple Degree Award
3. Areas for agreement with prospective partner institutions

3.1 The following areas should be agreed during the establishment of a new joint award arrangement, the establishment of a programme, its approval and subsequent monitoring and detailed in the memorandum of agreement and accompanying Activity Schedule before the commencement of the activity.

| Administrative arrangements | • Consider who will be acting as the lead institution for the purposes of the collaborative arrangement, particularly in cases where home rules will be applying to the students.  
  • Consider the role, responsibility and obligations for each Partner, particularly where these arrangements may be joint in all aspects of programme design, development, equal academic contribution, assessment and review, including related IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) where there is shared ownership of the curriculum.  
  • Consider how oversight of the programme arrangements and student activity will be maintained. |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Financial arrangements      | • Consider the level of tuition fees to be charged, including division of fee and HEFCE income taking into account any additional fees borne by the lead institution.  
  • Consider sponsorship and funding arrangements offered to the student. |
| Marketing and Publicity     | • Consider the content of how the arrangement will be publicised, including any costs associated and the use of crests, logos and trademarks or registered images in publicity material.  
  • Consider how the programme will be marketed and actively promoted to students, including launch date.  
  • Consider the contents of the material information sheet provided to students and agree information to be included from the Partner. |
| Recruitment and Admissions  | • Ensure that the admissions criteria meet the minimum entrance requirements of both King’s and the Partner.  
  • Consider any requirements from external accreditation processes.  
  • Consider how decisions will be made for admitting students to the programme, including the application process.  
  • Consider who will be responsible for advising students of the decision on their application, including rights of appeal. |
| Enrolment and Registration  | • Consider the periods of registration at King’s and the Partner, including mapping the programme structure taking into account relevant academic year start and end dates, periods of attendance.  
  • Consider student entitlements and access to facilities for the duration of the programme, particularly where students are unable to attend the relevant campus in person to enrol and register for their studies.  
  • Consider any student visa implications for the duration of the programme, particularly where the status of the student may be different for the Partner Country. |
| Student Records             | • Consider status of student and how changes to student status and student registration, progression through the programme will be managed between King’s and the Partner.  
  • Consider how student data will be shared to ensure consistency in record keeping, taking into account Data Protection and FOI legislation. |
• Consider any statutory reporting requirements for the programme (e.g. UK HESA returns) and who will be responsible for completing these.

Student Support
• Consider what pastoral support is available and how this can be jointly provided to students e.g. careers advice, language support, liaison between pastoral care tutors and accommodation.
• Consider what academic support will be provided to enable student integration into the programme e.g. induction events, student materials and liaison between academic tutors.

Teaching arrangements
• Consider how teaching arrangements will be shared and organised to meet the expected learning aims and outcomes for the programme.
• Consider how any opportunities for transferable skills will jointly considered and made available to students, including whether the programme facilitates any workbased learning opportunities.
• Consider if the student will be instructed in a different language at the Partner and what arrangements would be put in place to ensure the student understands what is expected of them.
• Consider how student feedback on their modules will be integrated.
• Consider any joint arrangements for ethical approval of research activity.

Assessment arrangements
• Consider the assessment regulations to be applied, including mapping the relevant marking schemes. Approval for mark translation schemes will be needed from the College’s Assessment and Standards Committee at the outset.
• Consider timing and reporting of assessment results to enable student progression and conferment of award.
• Consider opportunities for students re-sitting any elements of the programme and how this will impact on student progression and conferment of award.
• Consider arrangements for joint reporting of assessment results through relevant assessment board structures, including the opportunity for the external examiner to
• Consider how students will be routinely advised of their results.

External Examiner arrangements
• Consider arrangements for the nomination and appointment of external examiners and whether appointments can be jointly made and induction arrangements and expenses shared.
• Consider arrangements to enable the external examiner the opportunity to have the necessary oversight of the totality of the degree and joint reporting mechanisms.

Conferment of Award
• Consider the classification scheme that will apply. Where the intended classification scheme differs to King’s this will be subject to approval from the College’s Assessment and Standards Sub Committee at the outset.
• Consider what the student’s final qualification award or awards will be, including exit award availability within each awarding body charter and statutes.
• Consider how final assessment outcomes will be shared to ensure conferment of the award meets the academic standards of each awarding body, including date of award and student expectations should they meet the requirements of one awarding body, but not the other. It is expected that for Joint and Double/Multiple awards students will need to satisfy requirements of all awarding bodies to be awarded the degree. However, for Dual awards, students may meet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Certificates and Graduation**              | • Consider the information that will be stated on the final degree certificate or certificates, including any legal or institutional requirements. Where the programme leads to a joint award, consideration should also be given to how the certificate will be jointly undertaken and issued to the student.  
  • Consider the mechanism that will need to be put in place in the event that any awarding body needs to revoke the student award.  
  • Consider where students will attend their graduation.                                                                                          |
| **Student Conduct and Appeals**              | • Consider how information relating to student conduct, appeals and complaints will be shared between the relevant parties to meet the expectations of the OIA that King’s and their collaborative partners should make sure that procedures properly signpost students to the OIA scheme and follow the guidance set out in the Good Practice Framework: Delivering learning opportunities with others.  
  • The procedures given to students should clearly set out whether, when and how the student can take their complaint/appeal etc. to an awarding partner.  
  • It should be noted that the College will need to issue a ‘completion of procedures’ letter to a student even if the matter was handled under the Partner’s regulations. |
| **Quality Assurance and Management processes**| • Consider how arrangements will be jointly managed to meet the academic standards of award and is compliant with each awarding body quality assurance framework, particularly where all aspects of programme design, development, delivery, assessment, management and decision-making on student achievement are subject to both/all awarding institutions quality assurance processes.  
  • Consider what mechanisms are in place for ensuring that staff are suitably qualified to deliver the elements of the programme they are responsible for to meet the College’s expectations.  
  • Consider joint arrangements for student engagement and feedback within the programme.  
  • Consider what arrangements will be put in place to support the student should the agreement terminate before all students have completed the programme. It is expected that as a minimum a transition plan will be put in place taking into account the timeframe for enrolled cohorts of students to complete the programme, arrangements for teaching out the programme, student expectations, financial arrangements, reporting requirements and future relationship with the Partner. |
| **Monitoring arrangements**                  | • Consider how the programme will be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure the effective oversight of the programme and student expectations. The expectation is that a Joint Programme Management Committee will be established for this purpose.  
  • Consideration should be given to how outcomes will be shared across all partners to ensure that the academic standards of the award are being maintained and that the content of the programme and quality of learning opportunities, as a whole, is appropriate. |
| **Alumni Programme**                         | • Consider how information relating to alumni events will be advised to students.                                                                                                                         |

3.2 Further information can be found in the ‘Guidance on the operation of collaborative teaching activity’.
4. **Approval, Monitoring and Management**

4.1 Jointly delivered programmes are subject to the College’s processes for approval, monitoring and review and partnerships policy.

4.2 Where there are modifications to the programme as a result of changes in the partner relationship identified as part of the annual monitoring or review of activity processes these will be considered a major modification and will require final approval by the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee.

4.3 Management oversight of the programme rests with the relevant Faculty.

5. **Contacts for advice**

If you are proposing to develop a jointly delivered programme with another HEI then there is assistance within the College who may aid your deliberations:

- For any collaboration contact the Head of Collaborative Provision http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/contact.aspx;
- For any International collaboration contact King’s Global Engagement http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/worldwide/contact/Contact.aspx;

6. **Further information**

Please refer to the College register of collaborative activities for details of current jointly delivered programmes in operation at the College.

Relevant template forms are available can be downloaded at: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/Collaborative-Provision/collabprov.aspx

QAA publication on Joint Degree characteristics can be downloaded at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/joint-degree-characteristics-15.pdf?sfvrsn=c305f781_16
Guidance on the design of taught interdisciplinary, joint honours and major/minor combination programmes

1. Introduction
1.1 For the purpose of these guidelines a programme is defined as an interdisciplinary programme if teaching is provided by a department in King’s other than the lead department. The College Education Committee would like to encourage appropriate and challenging programmes of this type, but recognises that some questions need to be addressed at the outset. These are listed and addressed below followed by a checklist to ensure that all these questions are addressed during programme approval and monitoring.

2. Lead department
2.1 All taught programmes in the College must have a designated ‘lead department’ which is responsible for all aspects of the programme unless other, defined, responsibilities are allocated elsewhere. There should always be one King’s department to which the students on the programme belong. It is very important that students know who to approach with questions or problems, do not feel ignored by any department providing teaching, and are confident that their home department will follow up any areas of concern they have. The lead department will normally (but not always) be that of the programme leader.

2.1 The lead department will be responsible for:

- providing the appropriate facilities, or arranging that they be provided elsewhere;
- administrative support;
- overseeing timetabling;
- ensuring appropriate representation for students on the relevant fora (e.g. staff/student liaison committee);
- ensuring the allocation of a personal tutor/s.

2.2 The Chair of the Faculty’s Education Committee for the lead department will have oversight of the arrangements; but he/she will consult their opposite number in the collaborating Faculty where necessary, depending on the level of collaboration.

3. Advertising
3.1 Departments may wish to promote their interdisciplinary programmes independently of other provision and agree to share the costs. Otherwise the College’s web pages should include such programmes, linked to both participating departments, using keywords which will lead students to the relevant information.

4. Admissions
4.1 The administrative admissions procedures should be done by the lead department (or admissions office as appropriate), but they must ensure that the letter offering the student a place makes clear the nature of the interdisciplinary programme. All admissions correspondence should be copied to the other department so that they are kept fully informed.

5. Funding
5.1 Any grant or studentship allocated to the student should be administered by the lead department.

1 In the following “department” is used to cover Divisions or Institutes as appropriate.
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6. **Facilities**
6.1 The collaborating departments must agree at the planning stage what facilities should be provided, by whom and where. The student must have comparable facilities to the students studying in the collaborating departments and must be located within a community of students. He/she should have access to the seminars, specialised courses, facilities and lectures within both departments.

7. **Financial split between departments**
7.1 Normally the financial split will be formally recorded in the module approval form; for individual student projects this will be negotiated as required.

8. **Programme approval and monitoring**
8.1 As part of the programme approval process, the responsibilities of the collaborating departments must be defined in writing in the appropriate sections of the form.

8.2 Programme monitoring is the formal responsibility of the lead department but the contributing departments should have an input into the process.

9. **Responsibilities for assessment and examiners**
9.1 Responsibilities for the organisation and management of assessment, including external examiner arrangements and reporting, must be agreed. If external examiners do not have full expertise in the subject then two (or three) examiners, with complementary expertise, should be chosen.

10. **Procedures if there are problems**
10.1 These will, in the first instance, be dealt with by the lead department and the programme leader, who should keep the collaborating department informed, and consult them if necessary. Where a department is contributing teaching worth 90 credits or more, a named contact from the department should be designated for the programme (in addition to the programme leader in the home department).

11. **Checklist (‘standard’ recommended practice in brackets)**
11.1 The following areas should be agreed during the establishment of a new programme, its approval and subsequent monitoring. Not all of them require formal notification in the programme approval form but all should be agreed between the contributing departments:

- Programme
- Collaborating departments/divisions
- Lead department
- Faculty (of the programme leader)
- Name and contact details of departmental leads where 90 credits or more is delivered
- Advertising for project organised and funded by (lead department)
- Admissions procedures (lead department)
- Funding administration (lead department)
- Facilities – specify what will be provided, by whom (department of programme leader)
- Financial split
- Programme approval and monitoring (lead department and collaborators)
- Nomination of External Examiners (assessment sub board)
- Named individual who is responsible for ensuring problems are resolved (lead department and Faculty)
Guidance on off-campus study in research degrees

1. Introduction

1.1 The College regulations allow students to spend part of their programme in ‘off-campus study’ under conditions prescribed by the faculty of registration and within the framework of the General Academic Regulations and Academic Regulations for Research Degrees. Such conditions must ensure that:

(a) Prior permission is obtained by the student from the responsible authority within the faculty and that a plan for monitoring the off-campus study is agreed with the student by the responsible authority before any period of off-campus study is undertaken;

(b) The conditions set by the faculty ensure that the regulatory requirements of the College regarding attendance and programme of study are met;

(c) Regular contact with the supervisors is maintained;

(d) Where the period of off-campus study exceeds three months, arrangements are made through the supervisors for reports on the student’s progress to be made at regular (at least six-weekly) intervals;

(e) The student must centre their academic activities on the faculty of registration for a period of at least 6 months, of which defined periods of attendance should be at the beginning of the period of registration and immediately before the submission of the thesis and any other times specified by the Faculty. It should be noted that separate regulations govern students registered under the Public Research Institutions and Industrial Research Laboratories Scheme.

2. Additional guidelines

2.1 These additional guidelines are intended to supplement and inform the current regulations.

2.2 The responsible authority within the faculty is the Chair of the Faculty PGR Committee/Vice Dean for Doctoral Studies. They should satisfy themselves that (i) it is in the interests of the student’s work that they should undertake off-campus study; (ii) the institution or place in which they propose to study is suitable in terms of the facilities and academic supervision available, and that it is willing to provide the necessary facilities and supervision, and (iii) that the student will be adequately insured. A written agreement with the other university will normally be required.

2.3 The arrangements for monitoring the progress of the student will include the appointment of a local supervisor, who will supervise the student on a day-to-day basis, as well as frequent telephone or email contact with the student’s principal supervisor at King’s. In addition to this it is expected that formal monitoring will continue to take place.

2.4 In terms of attendance at the College, all students should be present at the faculty of registration at the start of their programme to attend enrolment and the induction course.

2.5 Any student wishing to spend less than the 6 months required at the College must gain the permission of their faculty, in order that an exemption to the regulations can be sought.

2.6 Students must be made aware from the start of the specific demands of a programme that is substantially off-campus, and that requirements for the submission are the same as for students in attendance at the College, i.e. four years full time and seven years part time, and that study off site will not be permitted as a reason for late submission.

2.7 For off-campus study double counting is not permitted, thus a student registered in this fashion will get a PhD of King’s College London and not of the external institution.
2.8 A template form has been created to allow students and staff to complete details of off-campus study periods. This can be used by faculties in accordance with their own procedure relating to off-campus study and students will need to check the relevant requirements to ensure information is submitted at the appropriate time.
Guidance on key principles relating to the management, monitoring and assessment of joint PhD programmes

1. Basic principles underlying joint PhD programmes
   Each programme should:
   (a) Be arranged with partner institutions of the same academic standing as King’s or higher;
   (b) Be organised between specific academic units in both institutions, so as to ensure that support structures for the joint degree are appropriate;
   (c) Be based on shared academic interests and complementary expertise;
   (d) Offer students clear benefits that will add to their academic development and their employability.

2. Management and monitoring of a joint PhD programme
   2.1 All programmes will meet the requirements of the General Academic regulations and the Academic Regulations for Research Degrees.
   2.2 All students should have a home institution, faculty and department/division and these will be responsible for quality assurance, pastoral care and progress monitoring.
   2.3 Students will be managed by the faculty that is hosting the programme at the home institution.
   2.4 Students are subject to the regulations of the home institution, e.g. relating to suspension of studies or complaints.
   2.5 Students will be selected against the host institution’s usual criteria through normal admissions mechanisms.
   2.6 Programmes will be reviewed by Joint Academic Committees made up of academics from both institutions, see the below Core terms of reference for a Joint Academic Committee for joint PhD programmes.
   2.7 Students will have supervisors from both institutions, with both being active.
   2.8 The College will maintain oversight of programmes via annual reports that are submitted to the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee, which will ensure that the programme is functioning as intended and that students are receiving the support they need and making the progress expected of them.
   2.9 It is imperative that a timetable is devised early on for each student, so that there is agreement about when the student will be studying in each institution and information is shared and suitable arrangements can be made well in advance. Depending on the requirements of the partner the timetable may need to be available before the student is admitted to the programme.
   2.10 Where it is intended that examination procedures will vary from those that are normal at King’s (e.g. the need for a public defence of the thesis), then approval for variations need to be sought from the College’s Research Degrees Examination Board. This needs to be agreed before the programme commences.
   2.11 Where the form of the thesis varies from what is normal at King’s (e.g. length of abstract) this needs to be approved, in advance, by clear specification of the variance in the
3. **Key principles relating to the assessment of joint degrees**

3.1 For students registered for a research degree dually or jointly with another institution, the Research Degrees Examination Board may, at its discretion, and on application to it by the faculty concerned, approve a different composition to the oral examination. Details of specific arrangements must be detailed in the Schedule of Activity.

3.2 In general, the Research Degrees Examination Board will be content with the academic standards of the institution with which the College has formed a partnership, and will permit the processes of the home institution to be followed. It is assumed that the practices and procedures of the home institution, that is the institution at which the student is initially registered, will be the ones followed in the assessment.

3.3 Notwithstanding the above, the principles listed below are a core requirement of any College research degree offered and must be met even where they are not the practice of the partner institution:

   (a) The examination process must be *bona fide* and must include a rigorous assessment of the thesis. This will normally be by means of an oral examination, but it is accepted that oral examinations are not held in all parts of the world and there are other equally valid ways to undertake the assessment. In countries where the oral examination is normally a public showpiece with the agreement to award the degree already agreed, one possible solution will be to hold both a full oral examination of the candidate and a subsequent public examination;

   (b) The assessment of the thesis (whether it is carried out by oral examination or not) must include at least two examiners that meet the criteria set down in the College regulations under “Appointment for Examiners”; though it will not necessarily be required to have one internal and one external examiner;

   (c) The candidate’s supervisors shall not form part of the panel which assesses the thesis (whether by oral examination or not), although they may attend an oral examination as an observer;

   (d) All members of the oral examination or thesis assessment panel must be approved by the relevant Subject Area Board.

3.4 When a joint degree is in the process of being established, it will be important for a full dialogue to take place at this stage, to ensure that the assessment arrangements are fully agreed and set out in the Schedule of Activity between the two institutions.

3.5 These principles also apply to students admitted onto individual joint programmes, whether or not under a co-tutelle or similar scheme.
Core terms of reference for a Joint Academic Committee for joint PhD programmes

Where a Joint Academic Committee (JAC) is established for the oversight of a research degree jointly offered with another institution, the following core terms of reference will apply:

1. For a joint PhD degree programme/partnership, a JAC must be established between both institutions and have academic membership from both.

2. Each university-based JAC will normally work independently to assess and monitor applications, but will meet as a larger group as necessary to discuss any developmental issues and review progress.

3. A single academic and administrative lead must be nominated, who will be responsible for taking issues forward and liaising with the scrutiny panel and partner institution.

4. For partnerships with a Joint PhD Schedule of Activity covering more than one faculty/department, there will be one JAC per international partner and they will oversee all programmes with that partner. Within King’s, the JAC will normally be composed of at least two Vice Deans for Doctoral Studies from participating faculties and will be established and supported by the Centre for Doctoral Studies.

5. Where a department-specific Joint PhD Schedule of Activity exists, the participating department/faculty will establish and support its own JAC and must comply with the below points.

6. The JAC will report, on an annual basis, to the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee (PRSS), chaired by the Dean for Doctoral Studies. The Subcommittee will have responsibility of overseeing the operation of joint degrees within the university as a whole.

7. The role of the JAC will be:

   (a) to ensure an approximate balance in admissions to the programme from both institutions;
   (b) to approve the admission of students onto the programme and oversee the quality of students admitted;
   (c) to review and approve a plan for each student’s programme, including the probable time and dates to be spent at each institution, research training arrangements and progression monitoring and reporting;
   (d) where necessary, to seek approval from the university’s Academic Standards Sub-Committee and/or Research Degrees Examination Board for variations to examination and assessment procedures;
   (e) to ensure that each student is assigned two supervisors (one from each institution);
   (f) to oversee the functioning of the programme; monitor outcomes for students and deal with any institutional barriers to the smooth functioning of the programme;
   (g) to provide annual reports to the scrutiny panel on individual students, programmes and the partnership as a whole.
Guidance on Doctoral Training Partnerships/Centres for Doctoral Training: approval, monitoring and review

1 Introduction

1.1 All of UKRI’s research councils have moved to funding and training students through Doctoral Training Partnership/Centres for Doctoral Training (DTP/CDT) type models. King’s College London was awarded an ESRC Doctoral Training Centre in 2010 (renewed as LISS DTP in 2016), a BBSRC Partnership led by UCL in 2012, and in the academic session 2013/14 the university was awarded the AHRC London Arts & Humanities Partnership (UCL led), the NERC London DTP (UCL led), and three EPSRC CDTs: Centre for Doctoral Training in Medical Imaging (King’s led), London School for Geometry & Number Theory (UCL led), and the Centre for Doctoral Training in Cross-Disciplinary Approaches to Non-Equilibrium Systems (CANES) (King’s led). In addition, King’s has a MRC Doctoral Training Partnership (awarded 2015), and holds an EPSRC Doctoral Training Partnership Grant, a Wellcome Trust Doctoral Training Programme award, and has STFC accreditation in Maths and Physics. The UKRI drive for doctoral training partnership models is to encourage more structured programmes, embed cohort learning, and focus funding in key research–led institutions. The UKRI DTP/CDT status can be viewed as a benchmark and increasingly additional funding opportunities and partnerships (academic, industrial and cultural) are being channelled through the DTP/CDT networks. UKRI have encouraged and engendered a consortia approach to DTP/CDTs and it is in response to this collaborative provision approach that these guidelines have been developed to ensure King’s has a robust and effective approval and monitoring programme across all our DTPs and CDTs.

1.2 This guidance is produced jointly by the Centre for Doctoral Studies, Programme Approval and Development Committee and the College’s Education and Research Committees as part of the Procedures for the approval and monitoring of collaborative provision to assist those developing proposals for Doctoral Training Partnerships and/or Centres for Doctoral Training.

1.3 The guidance draws on and is consistent with expectations and core practices of the QAA Quality Code and is designed to make clear the responsibilities of departments, Schools, Faculties and the university at the various stages of the process.

2 Definition and key characteristics

2.1 Centres for Doctoral Training (CDT) and Doctoral Training Partnerships (DTP) are defined by QAA as a partnership arrangement whereby two or more awarding bodies collaborate in the delivery of studentships, and personal, professional and career development skills training for research candidates. Included within this definition are Doctoral Training Programmes where there is a collaborative element to provision.

2.2 The key characteristics of DTPs/CDTs as outlined by QAA are as follows:

- One university is designated as the lead (home) university where the student is primarily registered;
- Each partner is responsible for the content, delivery, quality and standards of its own provision;
- May be used as a model of effective practice in providing research methods and skills training for research candidates and early career researchers;
- May involve a planned period of experience at the partner institution or supervisory arrangements;
- Normally, funded by UKRI Research Council studentships;
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• Governed by relevant sections of the Academic Regulations. The student is awarded a degree from their home institution.

3. Approval Process for new DTPs/CDTs and renewal

3.1 The approval and renewal of Doctoral Training Partnerships/Centres/Programmes are covered by the process detailed below:

Stage 1 (outline agreement to explore partnership): New opportunities for DTPs/CDTs/Programmes must initially be discussed with Vice-President/Vice-Principal (Research), the Dean of Doctoral Studies and Head of DTC Development (Centre for Doctoral Studies). This group will advise on whether King’s will centrally support the application.

Stage 2 (formal agreement to make an application): If central institutional match funding is required/agreed, then outline approval to proceed with an application will be given by VP (Research), the Centre for Doctoral Studies, territorial VPs (and Executive Deans where appropriate), and Finance based on outlined business and strategic case. Additionally, where the DTP/CDT is in partnership with another Research Organisation a Memorandum of Understanding will be agreed between partners.

Stage 3 (final approval and sign-off): For applications requiring central institutional funding VP (Research) and/or Dean of Doctoral Studies will provide final sign-off to all applications.

3.2 All activities whereby outside bodies deliver parts of a King’s programme will be underpinned by a legally binding Collaborative Agreement (CA) between King’s and the partner(s) setting out the roles, responsibilities and obligations of each partner for the duration of the activity. This may include a risk assessment for the partners involved.

4. Monitoring, review and governance of DTPs/CDTs

4.1 Doctoral Training Partnerships and Centres for Doctoral Training are monitored and reviewed at King’s by the university’s Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee, the King’s Doctoral Training Partnership Group, and relevant faculty research and education committees. All DTPs/CDTs are subject to:

• Annual reports (including a financial report where applicable): to be submitted to the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee (PRSS) and the King’s Doctoral Training Centre Partnership Group (KDTPG) for review. PRSS receives and considers the Annual Reports that each DTP/CDT has prepared for their Research Council/Funding Body (see Appendix 1), and if appropriate the King’s Academic Lead will be invited to attend to present their Annual Report and take questions.

• Periodic Site visits: periodic site visits are normally undertaken by the relevant Research Council/Funding Body in accordance with their policies and award requirements. In addition, the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee and/or King’s Doctoral Training Partnership Group may undertake internal reviews of Partnerships and Centres as necessary. This might include preparation for renewal, or resolution of issues identified by the DTP/CDT itself or the funding body.

• Reports to sponsors: will be submitted to the research council/funding body in accordance with their policies and award requirements; reports will be sent to the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee and the King’s Doctoral Training Partnership Group for information and the review.

4.2 In addition to central university oversight via the Postgraduate Research Students Subcommittee and the King’s Doctoral Training Partnership Group, each DTP/CDT has
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its own embedded governance structures (see Appendix 2), this normally includes a Management/Operations Board (or similar group) that help the Director/academic leads ensure the efficient and effective running of the DTP/CDT and the allocation of its resources. This Board will normally be made up of the key stakeholders who have delivery responsibility for the DTP/CDT. Some DTPs, including the London Arts & Humanities Partnership DTP and London NERC DTP, have cross-institutional representation Governing Councils on which the King’s Vice-President/Vice-Principal (Research) normally sits; the London Interdisciplinary Social Science Doctoral Training Partnership’s Governing Council is chaired by the King’s Vice-President/Vice-Principal (Research).

4.3 The King’s Doctoral Training Partnership Group has key two roles: 1. sharing of best practice between DTPs/CDTs and, 2. the resolution of College-level issues and challenges facing DTPs/CDTs. All DTP/CDT Directors/Academic Leads sit on this Group. The Group is led by the Centre for Doctoral Studies.

4.4 An annual overview of the university’s register of activity pertaining to Doctoral Training Partnerships/Centres for Doctoral Training will be undertaken with a regular report on new and successful completion of activity being made to the Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee and Academic Board.
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Guidance on equality of opportunity and access in programme and module review

1. Introduction

1.1 This guidance aims to ensure that when programmes are reviewed, this takes account of inclusion issues for all the protected characteristics\(^1\). The Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review asks that the Self Evaluation Document (SED) includes:

- An assessment of the effectiveness of teaching, learning and assessment and how these support equality of opportunity and access
- An assessment of the learning environment and how this facilitates equality of opportunity and access
- Consideration of relevant statistical data covering progression, completion and attainment and the outcomes achieved by different protected groups

1.2 Furthermore the Review Report must also make an assessment about the degree to which the programme has achieved the requirements above.

1.3 The university is committed to providing an inclusive and welcoming environment for all its students. It also has a responsibility under the Equality Act 2010, to promote an environment free from all forms of discrimination and to proactively address any differential outcomes. To achieve this, the university must closely monitor and assess the impact of its key activities and where differential outcomes are identified, alter its provision to meet the needs of students from different groups, hence the purpose of this exercise.

1.4 The university has made reducing the attainment gap for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) students a key priority and this now features within the corporate KPIs. Nationally BME students of equal ability are less likely to achieve a 1st or 2.1 degree than their White counterparts. King’s WhatWorks aims to address this issue and programmes are encouraged to pay particular attention to this issue when undertaking programme review.

1.5 It is important to note, that developing inclusive practice should not necessitate the compromising of academic standards. Instead it should allow an area of knowledge or expertise to be conveyed as effectively as possible within a learning environment that is accessible to all, in order to assist a diverse range of students to attain agreed academic standards. Inclusive practice will benefit all students and is essential for a world-class university seeking to deliver excellent teaching.

2. Contents of equalities guidance

2.1 The Guidance is divided into three sections and should help those preparing SEDs and review reports to address the requirements of the procedure summarised above:

- Section 4: provides examples of the sorts of issues that might be experienced by students with different protected characteristics\(^3\) which may impact on their experience at the university and hence their progression and attainment;
- Section 5: explains how the equalities data\(^4\) produced by Student Planning and Analytics should be used to help complete the SED and review report;

---

\(^1\) Period programme review is currently suspended

\(^1\) or \(^3\) A legal term used to describe the nine equality areas covered by the legislation, including gender, gender reassignment, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion/belief, pregnancy and maternity, marriage and civil partnership and age.

\(^4\) This data currently covers the protected characteristics of race, gender, disability and age only.
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- Section 6: provides examples of good practice which can be used proactively to help embed equality of opportunity and access into the delivery of programmes and mitigate any negative impacts experienced by students identified using the equalities data.

3. Flowchart of stages for completing the equalities aspects of the SED

Completing the equalities aspects of the SED and review report

SPA produces relevant programme review data in January each year (covering Student Composition & Performance)

The programme should review the data and identify any notable differential outcomes for particular groups. Further research will be required to understand any underlying causes (see Section 5)

The information in Section 4, which provides examples of issues experienced by students with particular protected characteristics will be of relevance here.

The programme should also consider broadly how to facilitate equality of opportunity and access within teaching, learning, assessment and the learning environment on the programme for all the 9 protected characteristics.

The programme will identify good equalities practice that will help to mitigate any adverse impacts identified in the data/promote equality of opportunity more broadly (see Section 6)

Record any notable findings, remedial actions planned or taken or good practice to be adopted in the SED and review report
4. Possible equalities issues experienced by students.

4.1 Below are examples of the sorts of issues that students with different protected characteristics might experience in relation to teaching and learning, assessment and the learning environment. These are provided as a guide to the issues and barriers that might arise and should not be used to form assumptions about the challenges experienced by particular groups. Some issues relevant to social class are also highlighted. Social class is not covered by equalities legislation but is highlighted here as a causal factor.

Teaching and learning
- Feeling inhibited to participate or experiencing feelings of not fitting in/bein the minority on the programme
- Unfamiliarity with approaches to independent study and thinking, self study or particular teaching styles and exercises that are part of the programme because either previous education was overseas, utilised different approaches or because the student has been out of education for some time
- Lack of confidence in ability because of extended period out of an education environment.
- Lectures and group work are not accessible to disabled students
- Handouts and course materials are not accessible to disabled students
- Inability to fully participate in practicals, field work or placements due to a disability or religious observance
- Timing of modules is not sufficiently flexible to accommodate religious observance or medical appointments
- Modules scheduled within insufficient time to make appropriate childcare arrangements
- Family expectations or family and childcare commitments inhibit the time available for dedicated study
- Course materials and content take a heterosexist viewpoint or focus exclusively on areas which are traditionally associated with the opposite gender

Assessment
- Assessment methods are not accessible and no attempt is made to modify them
- Timing of course work and assessments is not sufficiently flexible to accommodate medical appointments, periods of illness, religious observance and other non-negotiable external commitments
- Assessments scheduled within insufficient time to make appropriate childcare arrangements

Learning environment
- Challenges in obtaining accessible materials from the Library
- Adjustments are not made to the information technology available so that it is accessible for disabled students
- Student is not comfortable with sharing personal information relating to mitigating circumstances with the university due to different cultural norms or the sensitivity of the information
- Increased volume of administration in order to facilitate personal disability adjustments
- Student support services are not familiar with cultural needs or those relating to gender transition
- Difficulties adjusting on being away from home for the first time because student is particularly young, from overseas etc.
- Accommodation, social and leisure activities on offer do not take account of particular needs such as age, disability, race, religion
- Catering arrangements do not take account of health conditions or religious needs
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Other factors
- Financial concerns/hardship
- Working part-time
- Experiences of racial, sexual, homophobic or trans-phobic harassment
- Fellow students and staff take a heterosexist viewpoint

5. Using equalities data to support periodic review

5.1 This section provides specific guidance on how to use the equalities data produced by SPA to support the programme review process.

5.2 Key transition points: For the purpose of programme review, key transition points have been identified within the student life-cycle that help to characterise a student’s experience at the university. These transition points include:

- normal progression to second year (undergraduate programmes only);
- normal completion within expected time period;
- attainment of an upper degree classification/grade (first or upper second class degree for undergraduate and distinction or merit for taught postgraduate).

5.3 Key tables: Periodic review data is available on the dashboard, offering equalities specific tables that focus on the key transition points and enable the outcomes of students to be compared for the protected characteristics of gender, race, disability and age. These are detailed in:

- Student Composition – Programme Review - outlining attainment and composition data
- Student Performance – Completion, Progression and Award Reports - outlining progression and completion data.

5.4 Programmes should consider the data and identify any differential outcomes in respect of progression, completion and attainment for students with particular protected characteristics. Where these are considered to be notable they should be explored further.

5.5 As mentioned above, the College has made reducing the attainment gap for BME students a key priority and this now features within the corporate KPIs. Nationally BME students of equal ability are less likely to achieve a 1st or 2.1 degree than their White counterparts.

5.6 Where notable differential findings are identified, further research is likely to be required to pinpoint specific issues/causes and identify relevant courses of action. Further quantitative analysis or qualitative research such as focus groups, questionnaires or desk research might be required.

5.7 Sections 4 and 6 of this guidance can be used to help identify probable causes for these differentials and good equalities practice that will help to mitigate any adverse impacts.

5.8 Please contact the Diversity and Inclusion Team if you would like to discuss further research activities of this nature. Email: diversity@kcl.ac.uk

5.9 Where no notable differences in outcomes are observed a programme should focus broadly on how to facilitate equality of opportunity and access within teaching, learning, assessment and the learning environment using Sections 4 and 6 of this guidance.

5.10 Completing the SED and review report: Where time permits research should form part of the periodic review process. Where this is not possible, areas for further research and exploration should be identified and included within the Programme Review.
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Recommendations Form (PRFb) and subsequently followed up and reviewed in order to achieve sustained improvements.

5.11 The SED and review report must contain a record of any notable differential findings, remedial actions planned or taken or good practice to be adopted.

5.12 On-going review of findings: Any notable differential findings, should be examined for a further 3 years and any changes and actions taken reported on as part of the annual monitoring reports produced for College Education Committee.

6. Areas of good equalities practice

The information provided here should be used as a checklist by programmes to help them identify areas where they can proactively embed measures to support equality of opportunity and access. It should also be used to help mitigate any adverse impacts emerging from the analysis of programme review data in relation to progression, completion and attainment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific area / element</th>
<th>Areas of good practice</th>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery methods – lecturers, group work, seminars, tutorials etc.</td>
<td>• Where possible modify lecture and group work arrangements to enable all students to be fully included&lt;br&gt;• Respond to requests for reasonable adjustments and where necessary, consider whether the same material/competencies can be taught in an alternative way&lt;br&gt;• Use a variety of teaching and learning methods to cater for a range of preferred learning styles&lt;br&gt;• Instructions should be clear and explicit and backed up in writing&lt;br&gt;• Challenge any inappropriate/intimidating behaviour occurring between students or groups of students</td>
<td>Delivery methods can be made more accessible by giving due consideration to the following:&lt;br&gt;• Room layout&lt;br&gt;• Acoustics&lt;br&gt;• Lighting&lt;br&gt;• Communication support&lt;br&gt;• Pace&lt;br&gt;• Materials provided in advance in alternative formats&lt;br&gt;• Facilitating the use of assistive technologies&lt;br&gt;• Use of interactive multi-media approaches&lt;br&gt;• Good communication skills and use of plain language&lt;br&gt;• Inclusion of regular breaks&lt;br&gt;• Allowing recording devices&lt;br&gt;• Pairing students so that they can work with another who acts as a mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and learning resources</td>
<td>• Design module and programme materials so that they are accessible to all&lt;br&gt;• Where possible make written materials available in advance and compatible for use with assistive technologies&lt;br&gt;• Where appropriate to the discipline, consideration should be given to promoting the needs of a multi-cultural/diverse society by providing positive images of different protected characteristics&lt;br&gt;• Ensure that the language used is sensitive and demonstrates an awareness of the impact on certain protected characteristics</td>
<td>The following are examples of accessible written and visual materials:&lt;br&gt;• Typed lecture notes and PowerPoint downloads that can be used with assistive technologies&lt;br&gt;• Videos and audio-visuals with subtitles&lt;br&gt;• Paper-based materials in alternative formats such as in large print, on disk, online or different coloured paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing reasonable adjustments is a legal requirement under the Equality Act. It involves employers altering their practices and premises to accommodate disabled people so that they have equal access to employment, education, goods and services.
### Teaching and learning

- Provide glossaries of difficult terminology
- Where possible incorporate the use of memory aids and visually stimulating materials such as tables and graphs
- Provide reading lists in advance and separate into essential and further recommended reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other issues to consider:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workstations with enabling technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual learning environments where the layout and structure are suitable for students with dyslexia or with partial sight and where sound clips have text alternatives or subtitles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software which allows students to go at their own speed or take rest breaks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the Action for Blind People Guidelines for producing written materials for people with visual impairments.

### Practicals and laboratory work

- Where practical elements are essential to the programme, considerations of inclusivity should occur at the design stage.
- Where it is not possible to design practicals so that they are inclusive to all students, it will be important to consider whether there are alternative ways to assess the required learning outcomes, requiring ‘reasonable adjustments’ to be put in place
- When assessing what reasonable adjustments are required, consider whether it is essential for the student to physically complete the experiment or whether it would be sufficient for them to direct it
- Consideration of the timing and spacing of assessed practicals might enable students with fluctuating illnesses to participate fully
- In most cases there should not be tensions between health and safety requirements and an individual’s religious observance in terms of dress. Where specific factors pose a risk, these should be identified, and where possible reasonable adjustments or alternative learning activities put in place

### Field trips, placements, study abroad

- Where field trips, study abroad and academic/vocational placements are offered it is important to ensure that, wherever possible, all students have access to these opportunities
- Where possible, it will be important to ensure that placement providers have relevant equalities policies in place and that their facilities are accessible
- Placement coordinators should be trained in Disability Awareness
- Systems should be in place in order to pick up and respond to the needs of particular students
- Where placements are a formal requirement or standard component of the programme, ways to ensure the specified learning opportunities are available to all students

To increase accessibility, where possible, seek to:
- Find placements in accessible contexts
- Offer a range of destinations to choose from that can meet a range of needs
- Consider re-locating field trips to alternative sites, provide alternative experiences or comparable opportunities which satisfy the learning outcomes
- Build in flexibility regarding the required length of time in the field
- Build in flexibility regarding the assessment of field work components, so that it is possible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and learning</th>
<th>Programme structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>must be considered – including whether the same learning might occur virtually</td>
<td>• A programme which is flexible in structure will almost by definition be more accessible, although the scope for flexibility will vary between programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where particular students are unable to participate, appropriate alternative arrangements must be made</td>
<td>• In order to consider where greater flexibility might be incorporated it will be important to clarify the core elements or aspects of a programme, in order to make an assessment of where adjustments to teaching practices can occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For overseas placements in particular, it will be beneficial to provide students with a cultural orientation to prepare them for their stay, which might include background information about what a placement in that country/institution may entail, and commonly held attitudes and beliefs of the host country that might impact on different student groups differentially</td>
<td>• Students who work to finance study, who have family or religious commitments, who may have intermittent health conditions, as well as students with impairments, are among those who can benefit from a programme of study incorporating substantial choices within it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where possible timetables should be scheduled well in advance so that appropriate childcare arrangements can be made</td>
<td>• Where possible timetables should be scheduled well in advance so that appropriate childcare arrangements can be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to demonstrate learning outcomes via other means</td>
<td>A programme can be made more flexible by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify lines of responsibility for equalities legal compliance with collaborating institutions</td>
<td>• Clearly identifying which aspects of the curriculum are essential to a prescribed learning outcome and progression and which are more flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide support before, during and after placements that takes account of the needs of any disabled students, including transport needs</td>
<td>• Clearly identifying whether flexibility exists over the pace of delivery for the whole programme of study, allowing students to choose to study part-time or full-time, or a mixture of both, at different times of their programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid scheduling placements during school holidays or during times of religious significance</td>
<td>• Clearly indicating whether flexibility exists over the pace of delivery of individual modules or credits, allowing students to either complete all aspects of a module or credit as it is scheduled, or perhaps postpone some elements of it, such as parts of the assessment or a placement, for completion at a later date. This will allow students to take breaks without losing continuity for periods of illness or pregnancy etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider that some students will request to work or stay with those of the same sex, for reasons of religious observance</td>
<td>• Providing a choice of modules within programmes of study and ease of movement between such elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand how faith needs might pose restrictions on social and other activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teaching and learning

- Enabling flexibility over method of delivery (e.g. learning packages, use of e-mail)
- Flexibility can also be incorporated by acknowledging that there may be many ways of demonstrating competence in relation to a clearly defined programme objective. This may mean making available to, or developing with, students a variety of ways of demonstrating programme specific learning.

### Assessment – examinations, coursework and in-class assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific area /element</th>
<th>Areas of good practice</th>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is important to utilise a range and variety of assessment methods, in order to enable students with a range of learning styles and experiences to demonstrate their aptitude</td>
<td>Alternative assessment methods might include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment procedures should also be scrutinised to ensure that they are balanced and do not unfairly discriminate against any individual or group of students</td>
<td>• Problem-based assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If literacy skills such as spelling and grammar are to be assessed, this needs to be made clear and transparent</td>
<td>• Signed presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment methods should be designed with inclusivity in mind, including computer-based tests</td>
<td>• Viva voce examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where disabled students are unable to perform particular types of assessment, alternative assessment methods will need to be considered in order to test the relevant programme objectives</td>
<td>• Audio-visual materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where possible assessments should be scheduled well in advance so that appropriate childcare arrangements can be made</td>
<td>• Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where possible build in flexibility regarding the deadlines and timetabling of assessments, to take account of domestic commitments, part-time working, periods of illness and religious commitments</td>
<td>• Additional coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where possible coordinate the assessment deadlines for particular modules of a programme, so that the timing of assessments is staggered. This will benefit all students, but in particular those with specific learning difficulties such as dyslexia, who may become overwhelmed when assessments are clustered at one point during the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Learning environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific area /element</th>
<th>Areas of good practice</th>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student support mechanisms - includes pastoral support and monitoring of attendance and progress | The student handbook should include reference to the policies, resources and support that are available from within the Department to disabled students in relation to teaching, learning and assessment, including the Personal Tutor system. The handbook should also list other relevant sources of support such as the Disability Advisory Service, Disabled Student’s Allowance, Organisational Development Unit, Counselling, Welfare, Student Funding and Chaplaincy and relevant policies such as Student complaints, bullying and harassment, special examination arrangements, alternative assessments and mitigating circumstances arrangements.

   - Student handbooks and other important course materials should be provided in advance and in alternative formats.
   - Personal Tutors should be informed about equality and diversity and be alert to issues that arise that might hinder a student’s attendance, progression or achievement and be able to make relevant referrals as necessary. They might also need to be willing to meet more frequently with certain students.
   - Additional study skills support might be necessary for certain groups of students.
   - Personal Tutors and Departmental Administrative Offices should be located in accessible venues and ensure that their appointment times are sufficiently flexible to enable those with additional external commitments to schedule and attend an appointment.
   - Staff should be alert to issues relating to English language ability and make appropriate referrals to the English Language Centre.
   - Special induction and social activities should be organised for international students to help them adjust to their new environment.
   - Pair students with particular needs such as mental health disorders, under 18s, students on programmes where the vast majority of students are of the opposite gender, with other students who can act as a mentor.

Student support mechanisms will play a key role in identifying and helping to resolve student concerns arising from:

   - Financial issues including hardship.
   - Challenges settling in.
   - Periods of illness.
   - Family commitments which place restrictions on opportunities for study.
   - Challenges experienced because student is unfamiliar with the UK Higher education system.
   - Challenges experienced because previous School Type or class background differ from the majority of students on the programme.
   - English not being the student’s first language.

| Learning resources - including information services, staff and accommodation | Where possible a range of learning resources should be utilised including multi-media approaches and alternative formats to suit a variety of learning styles.

   - Ensure library staff are notified about the needs of any disabled students so that where relevant, adjustments can be made to the physical access, specialist equipment, assistive technologies, printed materials, ...
### Learning environment

| alternative formats, software, book retrieval  
and loan arrangements and any relaxation of fines  
| Booklists should be provided in advance to allow materials to be located and prepared in alternative formats  
| Postgraduate students may require a wider range of learning materials which maybe less accessible in their original form. Consideration needs to be given to accessibility at the point of need for resources such as archive material, print stock and e-resources  
| Where necessary disabled, mature or international students might require an in-depth tailored induction to the library  
| Part-time students and those with additional external commitments may need to attend the library when specialist staff are not available, so alternative support mechanisms will need to be considered such as on-line support or accessing provision at a more convenient location  

### 7. Case studies

#### Identifying and tackling differential outcomes

Statistics for achievement at Cambridge University revealed that all students performed well above the national average, whatever their ethnicity but that the three lowest performing groups were Black Caribbean, Bangladeshi and Pakistani students. Students from these three groups were less likely to get a first class or upper second degree than other groups and were more likely to get a lower second or third class degree. Consequently an in-depth research project was undertaken utilising both questionnaires and interviews. This revealed that for those students whose academic performance was weaker they were more likely to experience:

- Low levels of intrinsic motivation
- A difficulty in ‘fitting into’ Cambridge socially, or a fear of not ‘fitting in’
- Severe financial hardship and/or extreme worry about financial issues

As a result the project produced key recommendations that Cambridge could explore to improve the experience of ethnic minority students during their degree, these included:

- Reviewing the role of alcohol in college social events and during Fresher’s week, and finding ways in which more events could be staged without having alcohol as an integral component
- Exploring the possibility of providing Halal food in college canteens
- Identifying ways of providing additional financial support to those in extreme financial need
- Exploring the possibility of subsidised vacation accommodation for those without homes to go to during the vacation and for those who do not wish to return to parental homes in which conditions are not conducive to vacation study

#### An example of a project-based approach to analysing equality data

The Programme Coordinators in a particular Faculty (Institutes/School) identified that a large proportion of students were not completing their assessed coursework and therefore failing the programme. As a result they undertook some detailed data analysis using SPSS software which identified that this issue was more prevalent for students from particular ethnic origins, males and those who were more mature. When they explored the issues in more detail the most influential factor was the length of residence in the UK. Students who had been living in the UK for less than five years were struggling with the written work necessary to complete the coursework assignments.
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As a result the admissions process was modified to include a written assignment. Where students are not able to reach the necessary standard of written work, they are offered study skills support so that they can apply again the following year.

Further focus groups are being conducted to explore some of the other issues that have arisen from the initial data analysis.
Guidance on equality of opportunity and access in programme and module review
Guidance on professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) reporting

1. Where the PSRB visit is combined with the College’s periodic review process the procedure to be followed is set out in the Procedures for programme and module monitoring and review.

2. Where the PSRB visit is not combined with periodic review the following procedure will apply. The procedure specifies that authority for sign-off of the documentation and subsequent response to the report has to be at least at the level of the Executive Dean of Faculty, however some PSRBs may deal directly at Vice-Principal or Principal level.

3. The outcomes letter and report are considered by the College Education Committee and should be accompanied by:

   (a) a brief summary of the programme and its relationship with the PSRB (including a glossary of abbreviations);
   (b) a copy of the response made to the report;
   (c) a copy of the action plan responding to the recommendations.

---

PSRB notifies date for visit and documentation required

Notification may be received in the College at a number of levels but Principal, territorial Vice-Principal, Vice-Principal (Education), Executive Dean of Faculty and QSE office must all be informed

Documentation for the visit prepared by the Department/Division/area and signed off by the Executive Dean of Faculty before submission to the PSRB

CEC are notified of date of visit from Faculty

Visit takes place, involving as necessary those staff at Faculty and College as requested by the PSRB

Outcomes letter and report received and copied to Principal, territorial Vice-Principal, Vice-Principal (Education) and Executive Dean of Faculty

Report and response considered by FEC

Response to the outcomes letter and report signed off by Executive Dean of Faculty and sent to the PSRB

Response forwarded to CEC from FEC

Progress on implementing the recommendations is reported on in programme annual report to the Faculty and then Faculty annual report to the CEC
Guidance on professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) reporting
Marking framework

The College Policy

Assessment Sub Boards will be entrusted to apply the rules of the College Marking Framework consistently and fairly and Faculty/School Assessment Boards will be responsible for ensuring that the Assessment Sub Boards have conducted their marking processes in accordance with the marking framework and the adopted marking models.

In keeping with the College commitment to ensure that the assessment process is fair, equal and transparent, Assessment Sub Boards will select the most appropriate marking model for each assessment type within a module with the overall aim of improving the turnaround time linked to the marking process and enhancing the delivery of relevant and timely feedback.

Programmes must provide students with details of the College Marking Framework and the models that they intend to apply.

The Governance

Faculties should adopt the following Governance procedures for the College Marking Framework:

- The Faculty Assessment Boards when approving the Assessment Sub-board subject specific/ discipline-based marking schemes should ensure that the appropriate marking models are attributed to each assessment and that:

- Any individual involved in the marking process will have appropriate experience and expertise. It is the responsibility of an Assessment Sub-board to ensure that new examiners have suitable guidance and support to carry out these duties;

- The marking process is clear and details are made available in advance to external examiners including, for Models three and four, information on how the marking sample is selected and the size of the sample calculated;

- Details of the marking process are made available to students including, for Models three and four, information on how the marking sample is selected and the size of the sample calculated;

- Procedures for dealing with discrepancies between markers are compliant with the College Marking Framework, made available to all examiners and consistently employed;

- The original marks made by the first and second marker are documented and made available to the external examiner and at the Assessment Sub-boards for scrutiny;

- External examiners are given an opportunity to consider and comment on local procedures and their enactment in their final report;

- All final year projects and dissertations must be double marked in accordance with Model Two;
• Summative marks shall not be awarded for attendance at teaching events. Marks for participation should be restricted to small teaching groups or online discussion boards and must be marked in accordance with Model Five and Model Seven;

• All assessments, unless involving practice, performance, or presentation must remain anonymous, where practicable;

• Marking for modules or programmes delivered entirely online should be subject to the same assessment scrutiny as examination scripts and all other form of written assessment submitted for Faculty/Institute/School-based programmes.

That in order to instigate greater flexibility whilst ensuring probity, rigour and transparency across the College the following suite of marking models is adopted:

The Models

Model 1 – Blind double Marking

Blind double marking means that separate copies of the assignment are marked independently and anonymously, or the first marker makes no annotations on the work being marked so that the second marker examines all pieces of work as they left the student. Both examiners record their marks and comments separately and a final mark is determined.

The resources needed to undertake this model are considerable and it is often considered impracticable to do, consequently there is no requirement to ‘blind double’ mark all assessments but an Assessment Sub Board could adopt this approach if they so wished.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker with an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) as second marker.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Faculty Assessment Board.

Guidance for markers

Where there is a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original markers are required to reconsider. If there is still a discrepancy, a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

1 Provided by CAB June 2012
2 An assessor is a person with particular expertise or knowledge appointed to assist in setting papers, marking and attending practical examinations.
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- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

**Model 2 ~ Double Marking**

Double marking means that all examination scripts, coursework and report/dissertation or other forms of written assessment are marked by at least two Internal Examiners or by one Assessor and one Internal Examiner. Both examiners record their marks and a final mark is determined based on academic judgement.

**Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers**

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker with an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) as second marker.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

**Guidance on marking practice**

An experienced examiner determines the final mark following marking by internal examiners. Where there is a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original markers are required to reconsider the work. If there is still a discrepancy a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

**Rubric Violations**

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is still calculated and is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

**Model 3 ~ Double Marking by Retrospective Sampling**

Double marking by retrospective sampling means that all examination scripts and other forms of written assessment are marked by an Internal Examiner(s). A second marker then double
marks a sample of the work already first marked, the sample being randomly selected from across the range of marks (as below).

If this method is employed the following safe guards must be adhered to:

The sample size must be a MINIMUM of 10% of the entire cohort or FIVE scripts (whichever is greater) and include:

- For modules with less than 20 students enrolled – at least ONE script per classification
- For modules with 20-29 students enrolled – at least TWO scripts per classification
- For modules with 30 or more students enrolled – at least THREE scripts per classification

The second marker must not alter the marks of any assessments in the sample.

However, where there is a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original markers are required to reconsider the work. If there is still a discrepancy a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

If other patterns of inconsistency emerge between the first and second marker (such as both marking very high), then this must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-board who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken. This will include identification of the group of scripts that might be affected, following which, the entire group must be remarked. The Chair of the Assessment Sub-board should gain the approval of the relevant external examiner for the remedial action taken.

**Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers**

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker with an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) as second marker.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

**Rubric Violations**

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted a mark is still calculated and the is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.
Model 4 ~ Scrutiny ~ For level 3, 4 and 5 assessment only

Scrutiny means in this instance that all examination scripts and other forms of written assessment whose primary purpose is summative are marked by an Internal Examiner(s). A second examiner, who will have access to the grades and comments of the first marker(s), will scrutinise a sample of assessments to assure the quality of marking standards.

The scrutinised sample will be randomly selected to maintain consistency of marking standards. If this method is employed the following safe guards must be adhered to:

The sample size must be a MINIMUM of 10% of the entire cohort or FIVE scripts (whichever is greater) and include:

- For modules with less than 20 students enrolled – at least ONE script per classification
- For modules with 20-29 students enrolled – at least TWO scripts per classification
- For modules with 30 or more students enrolled – at least THREE scripts per classification

The marker scrutinising must not alter the marks of any assessments in the sample.

However, if s/he identifies a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original marker(s) are required to reconsider the work. If there is still a discrepancy a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

If other patterns of inconsistency emerge (systematic errors, very high/lowlow marks) in the marks awarded by the first examiner then this must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-board who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken. This will include identification of the group of scripts/coursework assignments that might be affected, following which, the entire group must be remarked. The Chair of the Assessment Sub-board should gain the approval of the relevant external examiner for the remedial action taken.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker provided that the element of assessment being marked contributes ≤ 15% to the overall assessment of the module. The scrutiniser must be an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor).

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is still calculated and is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the
lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

**Model 5 ~ Single Marking**

Single marking is where assessments are marked by one examiner. This approach is useful when marking formative assessments and small parts of summative assessments. If this method is employed in summative assessment the following safe guards must be adhered to:

No individual piece of work should contribute >15% to the overall assessment on a given module;

Any one examiner should not single mark work contributing to >50% of the overall module;

Single marking should not be the only Model of assessment employed in a module.

Independent checking should take place by an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) to ensure that systematic errors and/or patterns of inconsistency in the marks awarded does not occur.

If identified this must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-board who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken. This will include identification of the group of scripts/coursework assignments that might be affected, following which, the entire group must be remarked. The Chair of the Assessment Sub-board should gain the approval of the relevant external examiner for the remedial action taken.

**Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers**

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as a single marker provided that the element of assessment being marked contributes ≤15% to the overall assessment of the module. An experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) must maintain an overview of the marks awarded.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

**Rubric Violations**

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is still calculated and is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted.
- The module lead or Assessment Sub-board chair should be made aware of the situation.
**Model 6 ~ Online/computer based assessments**

This model is normally employed for multiple choice question (MCQ) papers. It is a requirement that a clerical check is carried out to ensure that the marks have been accurately collated and assigned to the correct candidate.

In the event of a failure of the IT system during an examination period and when the error cannot be attributed to student error, the following options are to be considered by the Assessment Sub-board:

- That students are offered a replacement examination, either in the same format, or an alternative form of assessment if appropriate (regulation A3, 20 refers);
- That the overall module mark is recalculated using marks from other summative assessments (if available).

When neither of the above options are considered acceptable suspending the award rules (i.e., award credit for the lost work) may in exceptional circumstances be considered.

The views of the external examiner should always be sought in these situations.

*Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers*

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed to carry out clerical checks that marks have been collated and assigned to the correct candidates.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment and Standards Committee.

**Model 7 ~ Ephemeral Assessment**

Ephemeral assessment is summative assessment where the evidence of the candidate’s performance is difficult to retain or cannot be retained.

Assessment Sub-boards will need to ensure:

- That the marking criteria for the assessment has been approved by CASC;
- That the format and conduct of the assessment and the criteria for marking are communicated to the candidates well in advance of the assessment event.

It is also recommended, wherever practicable, that the format of the ephemeral assessment is discussed with the external examiner and consideration is given to ensuring that either:

- More than one examiner is involved directly in the assessment event,
- or
- A second examiner or the Assessment Sub-board is in a position to review the paperwork arising from the assessment event so that any decision to fail a candidate does not rest solely with one examiner.
## College marking criteria: undergraduate

The College marking criteria set out below should be read in conjunction with discipline-specific criteria as appropriate and should be viewed as a starting point. The College marking criteria provides guidance on the overall standards expected at different grade bands but discipline-specific criteria may be needed in order to ensure that marking decisions are consistent, fair and transparent to both staff and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade A++ First 90-100</th>
<th>All levels</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outstanding answer, well written, highly structured &amp; informed, showing striking personal insight and originality</td>
<td>Full understanding of key facts demonstrating for example originality in written assignments, comprehensive understanding of the knowledge base and critical judgement.</td>
<td>Extensive understanding of key facts demonstrating an ability to formulate ideas in analysis, comprehensive understanding of methodologies with a high degree of precision, highly independent and critical judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full understanding of key facts demonstrating for example originality in written assignments, comprehensive understanding of the knowledge base and critical judgement.</td>
<td>Full understanding of key facts demonstrating for example originality in written assignments, comprehensive understanding of the knowledge base and critical judgement.</td>
<td>Extensive understanding of key facts demonstrating an ability to formulate ideas in analysis, comprehensive understanding of methodologies with a high degree of precision, highly independent and critical judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive range of sources used and applied, appropriately to the assignment and of outstanding quality.</td>
<td>Extensive range of sources used and applied appropriately to the assignment, insightful and of outstanding quality.</td>
<td>Extensive range of sources used and applied, to the assignment in a highly insightful manner and of outstanding quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellently structured, focused and well written presentation.</td>
<td>Excellently structured, focused and well written presentation. Compelling arguments made.</td>
<td>Excellently structured, focused and well written presentation Compelling argument throughout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grade A+ First 80-89   | All levels | Highly thoughtful answer informed by wider reading, showing clarity of thought, personal insight and originality | Thorough understanding of key facts with informed discussion. Evidence of critical evaluation. | Thorough understanding of key facts with insightful discussion, and independent and critical evaluation integrated throughout. |
|                        |            | Highly thoughtful answer informed by wider reading, showing clarity of thought, personal insight and originality | Thorough understanding of key facts with informed discussion. Evidence of critical evaluation. | Thorough understanding of key facts with insightful discussion, and independent and critical evaluation integrated throughout. |
| Understanding          |            | Thorough understanding of key facts with informed discussion. Evidence of critical evaluation. | Thorough understanding of key facts with evidence of evaluation in the discussion. Independent and critical evaluation. | Thorough understanding of key facts with insightful discussion, and independent and critical evaluation integrated throughout. |
| Depth of Knowledge     |            | Full range of sources used and applied in a focused manner. | Full range of sources used and applied in a highly focused manner. | Full range of sources used and applied in a detailed integrative way throughout the work. |

<p>| Grade A First 70-79    | All levels | Thoughtful answer informed by wider reading showing clarity of thought and personal insight | Thorough understanding of key concepts demonstrating insight and a good level of evaluation | Thorough understanding of key concepts with insightful and creative analysis. |
|                        |            | Thoughtful answer informed by wider reading showing clarity of thought and personal insight | Thorough understanding of key concepts demonstrating insight and a good level of evaluation | Thorough understanding of key concepts with insightful and creative analysis. |
| Understanding          |            | Thorough understanding of key facts with sound discussion. | Thorough understanding of key concepts demonstrating insight and a good level of evaluation | Thorough understanding of key concepts with insightful and creative analysis. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Upper 2nd</th>
<th>All Levels</th>
<th>Lower 2nd</th>
<th>All Levels</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>All Levels</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>All Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of Knowledge</td>
<td>A comprehensive range of relevant literature used</td>
<td>Comprehensive range of relevant literature, evidence is used to support arguments, awareness of wider issues.</td>
<td>Comprehensive range of relevant literature / evidence used demonstrating independent thought and extensive reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understandin g</td>
<td>Good understanding of basic principles and relevant evidence, with a coherent and logical argument</td>
<td>Good understanding of key concepts with development of analytical thought.</td>
<td>Good understanding of all key issues and wider implications with a convincing analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of Knowledge</td>
<td>Relevant literature</td>
<td>Good use of relevant literature</td>
<td>Breadth in examples and literature / evidence used without any major omissions. Demonstrates extended reading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Coherent and well organised presentation.</td>
<td>Coherent, well organised and logical presentation.</td>
<td>Coherent, well organised and logical presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound understanding demonstrated with some analysis</td>
<td>Sound understanding of the key issues is demonstrated, evaluative thought is apparent in some areas</td>
<td>Sound understanding of basic principles and main key issues with evidence of analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Sound understanding of most facts but is mainly descriptive.</td>
<td>Sound understanding of the key issues is demonstrated, evaluative thought is apparent in some areas</td>
<td>Sound understanding of basic principles and main key issues with evidence of analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of Knowledge</td>
<td>Appropriate reading, attempts made to use the material in the work.</td>
<td>Appropriate reading is demonstrated to support the discussion.</td>
<td>Appropriate material accessed but little evidence of extended reading, possibly some omissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Clearly presented but little development.</td>
<td>Clearly presented but little development.</td>
<td>Clearly presented and some structure but little development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic understanding of main issues demonstrated</td>
<td>General knowledge demonstrated but the work is mainly descriptive.</td>
<td>General knowledge demonstrated but analysis limited in depth and breadth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>General knowledge of some areas demonstrated but lacks detail</td>
<td>General knowledge demonstrated but the work is mainly descriptive.</td>
<td>General knowledge demonstrated but analysis limited in depth and breadth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth of Knowledge</td>
<td>Basic literature / material are limited. Low quality in a number of areas.</td>
<td>Sparse coverage of basic literature / material. Low quality in a number of areas and poor range of reading.</td>
<td>Skeletal coverage of basic literature / material. Insufficient use of known literature. Low quality in a number of areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsysteematic incomplete and / or inaccurate FAIL.</td>
<td>Some knowledge but limited understanding. Work contains inaccuracies and meaning is unclear</td>
<td>Some knowledge but does not focus on the question or is very limited. Descriptive work with little recognisable analysis</td>
<td>Key issues not identified poor analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Limited and/or inappropriate literature/material. Poorly referenced.</td>
<td>Inappropriate literature/material used in assignment. Key tests missing.</td>
<td>Inappropriate literature/material used in the assignment. Insufficient reference to the literature some key tests missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Disorganised/unclear presentation. Lacked logical order, structure not apparent.</td>
<td>Disorganised/unclear presentation with loose ends.</td>
<td>Disorganised/unclear presentation. Argument sketchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grade F Fail 20-32</strong></th>
<th><strong>All Levels</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unsystematic incomplete and / or inaccurate, FAIL.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unsystematic incomplete and / or inaccurate, FAIL.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>Work is mainly inaccurate or meaning is very unclear.</td>
<td>Very little knowledge lacks focus with no recognisable analysis.</td>
<td>Very poor analysis or none evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Poor and/or inappropriate literature/material. Shows lack of understanding of the assignment</td>
<td>Poor and/or inappropriate literature, lacking accuracy, unsound, limited range of sources. Demonstrated poor understanding of topic</td>
<td>Poor and/or inappropriate literature, lacking accuracy, unsound, limited/dated range of sources. Limited understanding of topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Poor presentation, spelling errors, limited structure,</td>
<td>Poor presentation, spelling and grammatical errors, unacceptably brief</td>
<td>Poor presentation, clumsy and disjointed, spelling and grammatical errors, conventions not followed, unacceptably brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grade FF Fail 0-19</strong></th>
<th><strong>All Levels</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unsystematic incomplete and / or inaccurate, FAIL.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unsystematic incomplete and / or inaccurate, FAIL.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong></td>
<td>Work is mainly inaccurate or meaning is very unclear, uncritical and confused. Difficult to follow</td>
<td>Very little knowledge and understanding of key concepts.</td>
<td>No analysis evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Poor and/or inappropriate literature/material. Shows no discernible knowledge or understanding.</td>
<td>Poor and/or inappropriate literature/material. Shows no discernible knowledge or understanding, lacks coherence.</td>
<td>Poor and inappropriate literature, lacking accuracy, unsound. Poor uses of sources, no use of evidence to support argument. Very limited understanding of topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Very poor presentation, poor spelling and grammar, lacks structure.</td>
<td>Very poor presentation, poor spelling and grammar, lacks structure.</td>
<td>Very poor presentation, poor spelling and grammar, lacks structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved CASC March 2015
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1 A mark ≥33 - < 39 is condonable where programme specific regulations permit
### College marking criteria: postgraduate

The College marking criteria set out below should be read in conjunction with discipline-specific criteria as appropriate and should be viewed as a starting point. The College marking criteria provides guidance on the overall standards expected at different grade bands but discipline-specific criteria may be needed in order to ensure that marking decisions are consistent, fair and transparent to both staff and students.

#### Level 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Depth of knowledge</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced, in-depth, authoritative, full understanding of key issues with evidence of originality</td>
<td>Complex work and key issues analysed. Wide range of sources used selectively to support argument/discussion</td>
<td>Coherent and compelling work logically presented</td>
<td><strong>A++ (90-100)</strong> Insightful work displaying in-depth knowledge. For research dissertation/project: publishable quality, outstanding research potential, originality and/or independent thought, ability to make informed judgments. Highest standards of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong evidence of critical approach to key issues and ability to evaluate arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A+ (80-89)</strong> Insightful work displaying in-depth knowledge. For research dissertation/project: work of publishable quality, excellent research potential, originality and/or independent thought, ability to make informed judgments. High standards of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A (70-69)</strong> Thoughtful work displaying in-depth knowledge. For research dissertation/project: good research potential, evidence of independent thought, ability to make informed judgments. High standards of presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| A coherent answer that demonstrates critical evaluation ~ Merit 60-69 |
|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Understanding                                      | Depth of knowledge                                                                 | Structure                                      | General                                                                 |
| In-depth understanding of key issues with evidence of some originality | Key issues analysed. Relevant sources used effectively to support argument/discussion | Coherent work logically presented | <strong>B+ (65-69)</strong> Thoughtful work displaying good knowledge and accuracy. For research dissertation/project: some evidence of research potential, clear thinking and/or ability to make informed judgments. Good standards of presentation. |
|                                                   | Clear evidence of critical approach to key issues and some ability to evaluate arguments |                                               | <strong>B (60-64)</strong> Work displays good knowledge and accuracy. For research dissertation/project: some evidence of clear thinking and/or ability to make informed judgments. Good standards of presentation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Depth of knowledge</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of some key issues with evidence of ability to reflect critically</td>
<td>Some key issues addressed. Relevant sources used to support argument/discussion</td>
<td>Competent work in places but lacks fluency/coherence</td>
<td>C+ (55-59) Work displays knowledge and understanding in most areas but the standard of work is variable. For research dissertation/project: evidence of clear thinking in places but lacks insight. Satisfactory standards of presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some evidence of critical approach to key issues and ability to evaluate arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td>C (50-54) Work displays knowledge and understanding in some areas but some key issues are not addressed. For research dissertation/project: some evidence of clear thinking but lacks insight and fluency. Satisfactory standards of presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A superficial answer with limited knowledge of core material and limited critical ability ~ Fail 40 – 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Depth of knowledge</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superficial understanding of some key issues, lack of focus</td>
<td>Key issues not always understood or addressed, gaps in the use of relevant sources used to support work</td>
<td>Weaknesses in structure, fluency and/or coherence</td>
<td>F+ (40-49) Work displays patchy knowledge and understanding and some key issues are not addressed. For the research dissertation/project: limited evidence of clear thinking, insight and/or fluency. Presentational weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited evidence of a critical approach to key issues and ability to evaluate arguments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### An answer almost entirely lacking in evidence of knowledge and understanding ~ Fail 0-39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Depth of knowledge</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of, or focus on key issues</td>
<td>Key issues misunderstood or not addressed’ Limited or no use of relevant sources to support work</td>
<td>Work is confused and incoherent</td>
<td>F (33-39) Incomplete answers with only peripheral knowledge relevant to the questions. Displays poor, disorganized presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence of a critical approach to key issues or ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>FF (20-32) Some attempt to write something relevant but with many flaws; nothing of substance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FFF (0 -19) Serious errors, largely irrelevant material or unacceptably brief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved CASC March 2015

1 A mark ≥40 - <49 is condonable where programme specific regulations permit
Translation of credits/marks attained through study away from the College

The College regulations make provision for students registered in the College to undertake, as a requirement or by request, a period of study at another institution (whether in the UK or abroad), subject to conditions. One of the conditions is that the Faculty/Institute/School must ensure that there are satisfactory arrangements for the assessment of the student’s performance while attending the institution and that these have been approved by the appropriate Assessment Board on an annual basis.

The College’s default position regarding how best to recognise a student’s achievements whilst studying away from the College is to transfer only the credits (not the marks) that they attain externally.

T24 – 26.4. Off campus study and credit transfer
The period of study spent taking modules taught and assessed by institutions other than King’s will count for credit only towards the final award, except for students taking such modules at level 6 and/or 7 where the marks may also count towards the final award. An Assessment Board that intends to permit study on modules taught and assessed by other institutions during the final year of a programme must ensure that a robust mark translation scheme has been approved by the College Assessment and Standards Committee on an annual basis.

A students’ final results would be calculated solely on marks obtained in modules studied at King’s. Students would be required to pass any modules undertaken externally in order to gain the requisite number of credits for an award. The raw marks obtained from the external institution would appear on a student’s transcript, clearly labelled as being obtained at an institution other than King’s.

College transfer of marks
There is still provision within the regulations for Programmes that wish to translate the marks attained externally on the understanding that the following guidelines are adhered to:

- Before any translation scheme is drawn up a thorough understanding of the partner institution’s assessment practices and standards needed to be established by the programme;
- Existing translation schemes should be the starting point for departments looking to send students abroad for the first time to see if an existing scheme can be adopted;
- Departments must ensure that a translation scheme is in place before any student study including placements are agreed;
- Translation schemes must be transparent and students must be aware of how their marks will be translated before they begin their study abroad;
- New translation schemes must be recommended by Assessment Board to the Academic Standards Sub-Committee for approval;
- All schemes must be re-approved at both Faculty and College level on an annual basis.
Translation of credits/marks attained through study away from the College

The marks awarded for studying abroad are translated according to the approved schemes (which has been drawn up in accordance with the above) and incorporated into the C-score calculation.

Approved June 2011 College Assessment Board
Updated July 2016 College Assessment and Standards Committee

1 Applicable to student who registered prior to September 2013 only. New students registered from September 2015 onwards Regulations T25 and T26 applies.
Academic Honesty & Integrity Policy

Expectations

Studying at King’s is challenging, rewarding and a place of respect and integrity. We expect all staff and students to embrace the values of the academic community. Students can reflect this by producing assessments in which the work submitted cites the correct sources and is the student’s own work. Students are expected to take responsibility for their academic work and to comply with the university’s standards and requirements. Help to gain an understanding of the expectations of the academic community is widely available and students are encouraged to make use of a variety of resources (see end of this document). Students who fail to take responsibility for their academic work are undermining the fundamental values of the academic community to which they belong.

Academic Standards

It is understood that for some students the cultural shift to university is significant and the university reminds students that they must take responsibility to familiarise themselves with, and abide by, the rules, regulations and ethical standards that are associated with a university education at King’s. Students at King’s are part of an academic community that values trust, fairness and respect and actively encourages students to act with honesty and integrity.

Academic Judgement

Academic judgement is a judgement that is made about a matter where only the opinion of an academic expert is sufficient. Academic judgement is developed over time and is defined by disciplinary expertise in teaching, learning and assessment in a university setting. Academic members of staff at King’s have significant knowledge and expertise in detecting acts of academic misconduct. The majority of students embrace and respect the values of their academic community but there is a small minority who may try to gain an unfair advantage by cheating. An unfair advantage is one that is not available to all students within the confines of a coursework assignment, such as purchasing essays or using prohibited materials. Academic staff may call upon the electronic software ‘TurnitinUK’ or other means to assist them in the process of matching text to the original source. Academic judgement combined with the detection software is considered to be a successful way to ensure that acts of academic misconduct seldom go undetected.

Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct at King’s is categorised into four areas: plagiarism, collusion, cheating through deception and fraud, and contract cheating. It is university policy that all allegations of academic misconduct will be thoroughly investigated and may result in action being taken under the university’s Misconduct Regulations. If a charge of academic misconduct is upheld the penalties range from a formal warning to expulsion, depending on the severity of the act or if it is a repeat offence.

Different types of Plagiarism

When submitting summative work as part of the requirements for a modular (examination or coursework assignment) assessment as part of a degree programme, credit-bearing short-course or period of study off campus/abroad that counts towards a degree, it is university policy that this work should be expressed in the student’s own words and incorporate their own ideas and judgments.

---

1 Definition according to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) found at http://www.oiahe.org.uk/glossary.aspx
2 The university’s regulations are concerned with summative assessment. Summative assessment is where the mark contributes to the final degree classification as opposed to formative assessment, which summarises the participants’ development at a particular time, but does not contribute marks towards the overall award. Misconduct identified as part of formative assessment should be dealt with by the department/faculty.
Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is the most common form of academic misconduct, and may arise intentionally or otherwise (e.g. through negligence, poor scholarship or lack of understanding). At King’s plagiarism is defined as the taking of another person’s thoughts, words, results, judgements, ideas, images etc, and presenting them as your own; including take home/online/open book assessments or examinations.

Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- **Copying**: a student should not copy someone else’s work or thoughts and pass this off as their own, even if s/he has their permission. This includes using images and audio-visual presentations without acknowledgement;
- **Incorrect referencing**: a student should not insert the writing or thoughts of others into their written work without the correct referencing;
- **Copying and pasting**: a student may not copy text verbatim or closely paraphrase a source text and pass this off as their own, without using quotation marks and citing the original source;
- **Paraphrasing**: a student should avoid closely paraphrasing someone else’s work (e.g. by changing the words or the order of the words slightly) and should always acknowledge the source using the appropriate citation conventions.\(^3\)

Self-Plagiarism:

Self-plagiarism is submitting material for academic credit which has been submitted, previously or simultaneously, for academic credit from King’s, or any other awarding body, or work produced by the student for other purposes (e.g. published articles). Previously submitted work may be included as long as permission to do so has been granted and where such work is properly referenced so that it is clear it has previously been submitted, or where resubmission of previously failed work has expressly been permitted.

Examples of self-plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- Undergraduate or Postgraduate taught essays containing work undertaken at a previous institution, including A-Level work;
- MA, MSc or MPhil thesis containing work previously submitted in pursuit of the subject of the thesis (such as from an undergraduate or postgraduate taught research project);
- Undergraduate or Postgraduate work reproduced from work undertaken by the student for other purposes (e.g. published articles, audit or other material in the public domain);
- Undergraduate or Postgraduate work previously submitted within another degree programme (where a protocol or an introduction is submitted for one degree and incorporated into a PhD final thesis).

Poor Academic Practice:

Poor Academic Practice occurs where a student shows a lack of understanding of scholarly practice and appropriate academic representation. Examples of poor academic practice are sources being cited incorrectly or inadequately or without quotation marks, even though the author is listed in the references.

There are a number of different reasons why someone investigating a case of alleged academic misconduct might decide that the student’s actions could be classed Poor Academic Practice.

These include:

- if it is the student’s first offence
- if the student is in their first year
- If the conduct relates to a fairly minor matter of referencing

\(^3\) Citation conventions vary according to discipline
• If there is other compelling evidence that the conduct arose from a genuine lack of understanding of academic integrity expectations

Poor academic practice should only be found where the alleged academic misconduct is not extensive, blatant or does not result from an obvious lack of effort overall.

Collusion:

Collusion is when two or more students collaborate, without permission, to produce individual assessments that when compared significantly overlap in content, order, structure and/or format.

Examples of collusion include but are not limited to:

• Unauthorised collaboration between students to produce the same or substantially similar pieces of work which they then claim as their own;
• One student submitting another student’s work (in part or as a whole) as their own;
• Allowing another student to have sight of a piece of assessed course work before they have submitted that work themselves (where students may be submitting the same course work at different times in the year)

Cheating:

Cheating is adopting working methods that are outside the spirit of the university Regulations and involve acting in a dishonest way to gain an unfair advantage compared to other students.

Contract cheating

Includes purchasing or commissioning an assessment from a professional writing service or third party and presenting it as your own and commissioning a third party to translate an assessment from one language to another. It also includes the use of a professional writing service or third party to edit an assessment or parts of it to cause changes to the structure or content. The College only allows the use of proof-reading to check spelling and basic grammar. Please see the College Policy on Proof Reading for further information in this respect.

Examples of cheating include but are not limited to:

• making up or falsifying data for an assignment such as a research project;
• falsifying medical conditions or evidence to gain an advantage (e.g. deadline extension);
• contract cheating: when a student submits a summative assessment that they have commissioned, which has been written by a third party or obtained from a professional writing service;
• taking unauthorised material into an examination;
• not complying with the instructions on an examination paper;
• not complying with the instructions of an invigilator;
• copying someone else’s work during an examination;
• talking to other students whilst under examination conditions;
• using unauthorised aids (e.g. a calculator or a phone) during an examination when not expressly permitted.

Sanctions

Instances of academic misconduct will be investigated in accordance with the university’s Misconduct Regulations [student guide]. It is university policy that cases in which the student is suspected of a
first⁴ offence of plagiarism or collusion may⁵ be dealt with under the Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP)⁶. All other cases of Academic Misconduct will be dealt with by a Misconduct Committee.

Responsibilities:

It is university policy that faculties/departments ensure that students have appropriate guidance and opportunities to familiarise themselves with the College Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy and the measures which students should take to avoid plagiarism and collusion in their work.

Accordingly, it is expected that staff will:

• Make use of the guidance on how to deal with plagiarism, which can be found on the King’s website at Staff Guidance on Academic Honesty and Integrity
• Provide students with access to the relevant KEATS module on plagiarism and supporting resources;
• Familiarise students with the specific citation conventions required by the Faculty/ School/ Institute/ Department;
• Ensure that students are aware of professional requirements (fitness to practice) should these apply;
• Provide students with access to help on plagiarism if it is sought (the library provide comprehensive support and guidance for students).

It is also university policy that students take responsibility for their academic work and comply with Faculty/Division/Department/programme standards and assessment requirements.

Accordingly, it is expected that students will:

• Respect their academic community by behaving with academic integrity and honesty;
• Seek help if they are unsure what is meant by the terms plagiarism and collusion. The library provide comprehensive support and guidance for students;
• Make use of the specific guidance for students that can be found on the King’s website at: Student Guidance on Academic Honesty and Integrity
• Access the relevant KEATS module on plagiarism and take advantage of supporting resources;
• Familiarise themselves with the requirements of their professional body (if this applies);
• Make use of the interactive tutorial module which includes advice on study skills, time management and citation conventions. It also allows access to a practice Turnitin UK assignment to help you understand the originality reports;
• Familiarise themselves with the specific citation conventions required by their Faculty/ School/ Institute/ Department;
• Sign a declaration with each assessment that the assignment submitted is their own work

Professional Body Requirements: Fitness to Practice

Accusations of plagiarism can impact on an individual’s fitness to practice in a professional capacity. Faculties have different guidance on fitness to practice and these can be found at:

University Guidance
Regulations on Fitness to Practice

⁴ For the sake of clarity if a student has had a first offence of plagiarism and the second offence is collusion this counts as a second offence and vice versa.
⁵ Faculties have the right to refer first offences of plagiarism or collusion to a Misconduct Committee at their discretion
⁶ As detailed in the Staff Guidance on Academic Honesty and Integrity
Academic honesty and integrity

Faculty of Dentistry, Oral and Craniofacial Sciences –
General Dental Council Fitness to Practice Guidance

Faculty Life Sciences & Medicine School of Medical Education -
Medicine Fitness to Practice Guidance

Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery and Palliative Care –
Nursing and Medical Council Code

Support

Library Services offer a guide to referencing which can be accessed on their webpages.

There is also online guidance on the English Language Centre pages on the Principles of Academic writing and Referencing.

Students can also contact the KCLSU Advice Service or access online advice on their webpages.

Approved College Assessment Board June 2011
Approved College Assessment and Standards Committee August 2016
Approved College Assessment and Standards Committee March 2018
Approved Academic Standards Sub Committee June 2019
College guidance for staff on academic honesty and integrity

This Guidance should be read in conjunction with the College’s Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy

Responsibilities:

It is College policy that faculties/departments ensure that students have appropriate guidance and opportunities to familiarise themselves with the College’s Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy.

Accordingly, it is expected that staff will:

- Make use of this guidance on how to deal with academic misconduct;
- Provide students with access to the relevant KEATS Self Enrol module on plagiarism and supporting resources;
- Familiarise students with the specific citation conventions required locally by the Faculty/School/Institute/Department;
- Ensure that students are aware of professional requirements (fitness to practice) should these apply;
- Provide students with access to help on plagiarism and collusion if it is sought. The library provide comprehensive support and guidance for students; further information can be found online: http://libguides.kcl.ac.uk/studyskills

All students are required to sign a statement at the start of their programme of study agreeing to abide by the principles by the College’s Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy. In addition, when submitting individual pieces of coursework, students should be required to sign the statement again confirming that the work they have submitted is their own.

How to help prevent plagiarism and collusion
The following list provides some suggestions of ways to help students avoid plagiarism/collusion:

1. Tutorials may be used to prompt students to act more appropriately;
2. Consider providing fewer summative essays;
3. Avoid common topics and change topics regularly. Possibly refer back to discussions in class in the questions, or in themes in the handouts;
4. Focus on the process as well as the outcome, i.e. get students to:
   i. Give reasons for and to justify their views in the essays;
   ii. Reflect upon their final essay in public, perhaps in a representation or done under exam conditions, to spot important differences in phraseology etc.
5. Make it compulsory for students to send an outline of their work at an earlier date for review and comments and retain for future comparison;
6. Verify and/or observe one or more stages of production of the assessment;
7. Redesign assessments, for example, to focus on an unusual format for submission such as a critique of a specific resource. The more individualised and unusual the problem, the harder it is for material to be plagiarised;
College guidance for staff on academic honesty and integrity

8. Consider giving students individualised data, contexts, characteristics or situations, in this way you lessen the chances of them copying from each other. Ask them to rank, justify or otherwise argue for an evidence-based solution, which may enable individualised activity;

9. Make it clear when collaboration is allowed in assignments and when assignments are for the individual only to complete;

10. For self-plagiarism make it clear when this might occur.

Relevant regulations

Cases of suspected academic misconduct will be dealt with under the College’s Misconduct Regulations.

Examples of Academic Misconduct

i. Plagiarism (including self plagiarism)
ii. Collusion
iii. Examination Misconduct
iv. Contract Cheating

For Definitions of Different Types of Academic Misconduct and Related Terminology please see the College’s Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy.

Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP) (Please refer to flowchart at Appendix A – Academic Misconduct Flowchart and Appendix B – LAMP Flowchart)

All first offences of plagiarism and/or collusion may be dealt with at Faculty/Department level under the Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP) with the option to refer sufficiently serious cases, or those with significant mitigation, at the discretion of the Assessment Sub Board (ASB) Chair to the Student Conduct & Appeals (SCA) for consideration by a Misconduct Committee. All second offences of plagiarism and collusion must be referred to SCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee.

Examples of other serious offences which should be referred to a Misconduct Committee are:

- When a student submits a summative assessment that has been written by a third party or obtained from a professional writing service (also known as “Contract Cheating”);
- When medical conditions or evidence are falsified to gain an advantage (e.g. deadline extension) although these may also be considered as non-academic misconduct.

There are four possible outcomes of the LAMP:

- No further action will be taken;
- The student may be found to have committed poor academic practice rather than misconduct;
- The student may be found to have committed academic misconduct, in which case they can sign a form accepting this; or
• If serious concerns remain that cannot be addressed through LAMP, the matter will be referred to the HoSCA who will report this to a Misconduct Committee.

Penalties – (further details please see General Misconduct Guidance)

If a student is found to have committed academic misconduct at the LAMP meeting and agrees to sign a Statement to this effect, then the following penalties will apply:

1. Students, studying at Level 6 and below will be given a mark of zero for the assessment/s in question, with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if applicable)
2. Students, studying at Level 7 and above will be given a mark of zero for all assessments in the module/s in question, with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if applicable)

In accordance with regulation T21.4, any reassessment following the above penalty will result in the module mark being capped at the pass mark.

Mitigating factors as well as aggravating factors should be taken into consideration when determining whether these penalties are appropriate and if not, the case should be referred to the HoSCA for a Misconduct Committee.

Steps in LAMP

Step 1
Where an Examiner identifies a case of suspected plagiarism in assessed work or suspects another form of related cheating (eg collusion), they should refer the matter to the Chair (or Deputy) of the relevant ASB\(^{109}\). No mark shall be assigned to the work and consideration of the student’s results should be held in abeyance until the matter has been resolved.

Step 2
Following consideration of the written evidence (eg the suspected work(s) and plagiarised sources where relevant), the Chair (or Deputy) of the ASB will make one of the following academic judgements:

(i) **Judgement** - the work is not suspect (i.e. there is no plagiarism or collusion) and there is no case to answer;
**Action** – the work will be returned to the Examiners for marking without further action.

(ii) **Judgement** - there is suspected academic misconduct such as plagiarism or other related form of cheating such as collusion;
**Action** - the Chair of the ASB will ascertain whether or not this constitutes a first offence. If this is a first offence, the Chair will investigate the matter under this procedure; if it is a second/subsequent offence it should be referred to the HoSCA for the commencement of formal proceedings under the Misconduct Regulations.

\(^{109}\) Where a student is taking a module outside their home department the ASB which hosts the module should deal with the matter under LAMP including any referrals to SCA. It should also report its findings to the ASB of the home department.
Step 3
In the event of (ii) above, where suspected academic misconduct has been determined and the alleged
offence has not been referred to the HoSCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee, the
student(s) will be invited by the ASB Chair to a meeting. The meeting is not a Hearing: it is merely an
opportunity for the Examiners to present the student with the evidence and to come to a view as to
whether or not academic misconduct has in fact occurred. If, following meeting, the Chair (or Deputy)
is satisfied that it has occurred, the student should be offered the opportunity to admit to the academic
misconduct without the initiation of Misconduct Committee proceedings. The student does not have
to attend the meeting and can ask for the case to be referred for formal consideration by a Misconduct
Committee. The student can also contest the allegations following the meeting, in which case the
matter will be referred to SCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee.

Guidance on meeting under LAMP

Please see email templates at Appendix C and D for the invitation to a LAMP meeting. As the meeting
is not a Hearing it should be kept relatively informal; a student may be accompanied by another College
member, a member of KCLSU, or by a friend or family member. Formal legal counsel will not be
permitted to accompany the student. If the student insists on attending the interview with formal
representation, the matter should be referred to HoSCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee.

The student will be allowed a sign language communicator or interpreter as a reasonable adjustment.
The interview will be conducted by the ASB Chair (or Deputy) and one other Examiner.

The format of the interview will be as follows:

- the student will be advised at the outset of the purpose of the meeting and of the possible
  consequences of the meeting and it should be reiterated that it is not a Hearing;
- the student will be presented with their work and why the Examiners consider there
  may be a case of plagiarism or other related form of cheating, such as collusion. The
  student will be invited to explain any relevant circumstances surrounding the production
  of their work and, if appropriate, invited to agree with the Examiners that the work
  contains plagiarism/cheating. As part of this process the student should be allowed to
  produce previous drafts of their work;
- The Chair will determine one of the following outcomes:

1. Poor academic practice
2. No further action
3. Academic misconduct has occurred
4. Referral to the HoSCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee

If the student acknowledges the academic misconduct, they should be asked to sign a Statement
(Appendix F) confirming their acknowledgement within 5 working days of the meeting under LAMP.
No pressure should be applied to the student to sign the Statement. If the student acknowledges the
academic misconduct the following penalties will be given:

- Students studying at Level 6 and below, will be given a mark of zero for the assessment/s
  in question, with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if applicable)
- Students studying at Level 7 and above will be given a mark of zero for all assessments in
  the module/s in question, with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if applicable)

Guidance following the meeting under LAMP
The Faculty/Department should email the student using the template in Appendix E of this document including the Statement of Acknowledgement in Appendix F. The student should be given 5 working days in which to sign the Statement and return it to the Faculty. If the student does not wish to sign the Statement they can contest the allegation and the Faculty will refer the case to the HoSCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee.

The student should be given the opportunity to consider their position and not put under pressure to sign the Statement.

If the student does not return the Statement but does not contest the allegation within 5 working days, the Chair can decide that academic misconduct has taken place and give one of the penalties as detailed above, as appropriate. The student can contest this decision within 5 working days with SCA and the matter will then be referred to a Misconduct Committee.

If the student does not attend an initial meeting, they should be offered one further opportunity to attend. Should the student not attend either meeting, the Chair can decide whether academic misconduct has taken place and give one of the penalties as detailed above, as appropriate. The student can contest this decision within 5 working days with SCA and the matter will then be referred to a Misconduct Committee. Please see Appendix G for email template for students who do not attend two meetings.

Referral of Cases to the HoSCA for Consideration by a Misconduct Committee

On referral to the HoSCA under the College’s Misconduct Regulations the ASB Chair (or Deputy) should provide the Head of Student Conduct & Appeals with the following:

a. A misconduct referral form outlining the Chair’s academic judgement and the basis for this judgement, including any other relevant information;
b. a copy of the suspect work with the areas of suspected plagiarism/collusion annotated and a copy of the sources (where applicable), cross-referenced to the work in question;
c. a copy of any Turnitin (or similar) report (where applicable);
d. a note of any interview with the student (where applicable).

The Chair may wish to seek the opinion of a second Examiner or an External Examiner. The opinion of an External Examiner may be forwarded to SCA at a later date.

Once a case has been referred to the HoSCA all correspondence with the student relating to the allegation will be undertaken by SCA. However, the Chair, or other appropriate member of the Assessment Board will be invited to present the case against the student at any subsequent Misconduct Committee Hearing arising and provide programme information and representations on behalf of the Faculty (Institute/School).

Further Guidance on Contract Cheating

Contract cheating or the use of an essay mill is considered cheating and will be considered under the G27 Misconduct Regulation. King’s takes academic misconduct very seriously, thoroughly investigating all allegations under the aforementioned procedure. Please also see the College Policy on Proof Reading.

How Faculties can detect the use of contract cheating ‘essay mills’

All work at King’s should be scanned through Turnitin; the database this software uses not only consists of material from books, academic journals, websites and magazines, but also contains assignments previously submitted to universities around the world. Work should be reviewed to
ascertain whether the student has followed the departmental guidance on citations and referencing, and whether a student’s submissions vary in style from previous submissions, or other identifying features. As a further means of prevention, Departments could consider students having to submit outlines of their work or drafts, or conducting peer reviews. Any such documents submitted could be retained for comparison with the final submission of the work.

If a Department has suspicions that a student may have submitted work authored by a third party, they should invite the student to a meeting in order to discuss the work with them. This meeting should allow the student to reflect upon their essay, and to give reasons for and to justify their views in the assessment. This meeting can then be used to form the basis of a Faculty investigation of academic misconduct or a referral to SCA as major academic misconduct if third party involvement is suspected.

Whilst the Department need to advise the student that the meeting has been convened in order to discuss their assignment, it will need to be arranged quickly and without too much information being given to the student beyond its purpose of discussing a recent submission. It is an investigatory meeting, not a final meeting under LAMP, and therefore the student will not be given detailed information about the allegations but they may be accompanied by someone from KCLSU Advice. The student will be allowed a sign language communicator or interpreter as a reasonable adjustment. If a student chooses not to attend a meeting with the relevant member of academic staff, the Faculty may choose to refer the case to SCA for consideration by a Misconduct Committee if it believes it has sufficient evidence, but the Faculty may not impose a penalty locally.
Appendix A

Academic Misconduct Flow Chart

Examiner marking script (or other assessed work) suspects academic misconduct and informs:

- Assessment Sub Board Chair (or Deputy Chair) who determines whether:
  - (i) no case to answer
  - (ii) the case is one of suspected academic misconduct

- The assessed work is returned to the Examiner for marking in line with local marking policy
- First offence
- Second offence

See LAMP flowchart overleaf
A referral is made to SCA for proceedings under the Misconduct Regulations
Appendix B
LAMP Flow Chart

Where the Assessment Sub Board Chair (or Deputy Chair) has determined that the case is one of suspected academic misconduct, and it is a first offence, the student should be invited to a meeting:

At a meeting with the student, the Chair and one other Examiner determine:

- No Further Action
- There is poor academic practice
- There is evidence of academic misconduct

The assessed work is returned to the Examiner for marking in line with local marking policy

The Examiners award a penalty mark of zero - the resit eligibility remains unchanged

A referral is made to SCA for proceedings under the Misconduct Regulations

The student accepts the charge within 5 days of the meeting

The student did not attend the meeting

The student does not accept the charge and/or penalty

The penality is applied, and the matter is concluded

The student contests

The penalty is applied, the student is given 5 days to contest. If they do not contest the matter is concluded
Dear XXXX

Re. Suspected Plagiarism/Collusion (delete as appropriate)

I am writing to let you know that [NAME OF EXAMINER] has drawn my attention to case of suspected plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE] in a piece of assessed work submitted by you as part of Module [MODULE NAME + CODE].

In accordance with the procedures detailed in the Staff and Student Guidance on Academic Honesty & Integrity, I have considered the written evidence, including the suspect work and the alleged sources, and have formed the view that there may be plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE].

As this is a first offence of plagiarism/collusion (delete as appropriate) the matter can be dealt under the Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP) set out in the Student Guidance on Academic Honesty & Integrity. LAMP is intended to provide a supportive process, in which you will have the opportunity to discuss your work and to receive feedback on areas of concern. If you do not want this case to be considered under LAMP, you have the right to request that your case is referred for formal consideration by Student Conduct & Appeals under the College’s Misconduct Regulations. This will provide you with an opportunity to have your case heard by the College’s Misconduct Committee.

You are requested to attend a LAMP meeting at [TIME] on [DATE] in [VENUE]. The following members of staff will be present:

XXXXXX
XXXXXX

You may be accompanied at the meeting by any member of the College or KCLSU Advice. The purpose of the meeting is for the Examiners to present you with your work and to explain to you what they consider to be the issues with it and for you to explain about the process which you used to write your assessment. They will then decide on one of the following outcomes:

1. No further action will be taken
2. There is poor academic practice
3. There is evidence of academic misconduct

In the case of 3. ‘evidence of academic misconduct’ you will be asked if you are willing to sign a statement agreeing that you have committed the offence. You will have up to 5 working days after the meeting in which to decide whether you agree with this. If you sign the statement you will be given the penalty of a mark of zero for the assessment with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if resubmission is eligible). If you disagree with the charge or penalty you can contest it and it will be sent to Student Conduct & Appeals for formal proceedings to be started under the College’s Misconduct Regulations. This is likely to result in a full hearing of your case by the College’s Misconduct Committee. Please note that if you are found guilty of plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE], the Misconduct Committee will far wider range of penalties available to it than the penalty available under LAMP.
Please also note that none of your marks or results will be considered or released until this matter has been concluded.

If you require reasonable adjustments in respect of the meeting, please contact us as soon as possible so that the necessary arrangements can be made.

For further information, please consult the Student Guidance on Academic Honesty & Integrity, published on the ‘Student Conduct and Appeals’ section of the College website.

For clarification on any aspect of this matter you may contact the Student Conduct & Appeals on 020 7848 3989, or e-mail appeals@kcl.ac.uk. You may also wish to contact the KCLSU Advice Service on 020 7848 4588 or www.kclsu.org/adviceform.

Yours sincerely

XXXXX
Appendix D

Email Template for Students studying at Level 7 and above

Dear XXXX

Re. Suspected Plagiarism/Collusion (delete as appropriate)

I am writing to let you know that [NAME OF EXAMINER] has drawn my attention to case of suspected plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE] in a piece of assessed work submitted by you as part of Module [MODULE NAME + CODE].

In accordance with the procedures detailed in the Staff and Student Guidance on Academic Honesty & Integrity, I have considered the written evidence, including the suspect work and the alleged sources, and have formed the view that there may be plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE].

As this is a first offence of plagiarism/collusion (delete as appropriate) the matter can be dealt under the Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP) set out in the Student Guidance on Academic Honesty & Integrity. LAMP is intended to provide a supportive process, in which you will have the opportunity to discuss your work and to receive feedback on areas of concern. If you do not want this case to be considered under LAMP, you have the right to request that your case is referred for formal consideration by Student Conduct & Appeals under the College’s Misconduct Regulations. This will provide you with an opportunity to have your case heard by the College’s Misconduct Committee.

You are requested to attend a LAMP meeting at [TIME] on [DATE] in [VENUE]. The following members of staff will be present:

XXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXX

You may be accompanied at the meeting by any member of the College or KCLSU Advice. The purpose of the meeting is for the Examiners to present you with your work and to explain to you what they consider to be the issues with it and for you to explain about the process which you used to write your assessment. They will then decide on one of the following outcomes:

No further action will be taken
There is poor academic practice
There is evidence of academic misconduct

In the case of 3. ‘evidence of academic misconduct’ you will be asked if you are willing to sign a statement agreeing that you have committed the offence. You will have up to 5 working days after the meeting in which to decide whether you agree with this. If you sign the statement you will be given the penalty of a mark of zero for the module with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if resubmission is eligible). If you disagree with the charge or penalty you can contest it and it will be sent to Student Conduct & Appeals for formal proceedings to be started under the College’s Misconduct Regulations. This is likely to result in a full hearing of your case by the College’s Misconduct Committee. Please note that if you are found guilty of plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE], the Misconduct Committee a far wider range of penalties available to it than the penalty available under LAMP.

Please also note that none of your marks or results will be considered or released until this matter has been concluded.
If you require reasonable adjustments in respect of the meeting, please contact us as soon as possible so that the necessary arrangements can be made.

For further information, please consult the Student Guidance on Academic Honesty & Integrity, published on the ‘Student Conduct and Appeals’ section of the College website.
For clarification on any aspect of this matter you may contact the Student Conduct & Appeals on 020 7848 3989, or e-mail appeals@kcl.ac.uk. You may also wish to contact the KCLSU Advice Service on 020 7848 4588 or www.kclsu.org/adviceform.

Yours sincerely

XXXXX
Appendix E

Dear [XXXX]

Re. Outcome of interview with the Examiners

Further to our meeting on [DATE], I am writing to confirm that you admitted to the charge of plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE] and a mark of zero will be assigned to the assessment/module [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE10] a copy of your signed acknowledgement is enclosed.

As far as the College is concerned this is the end of the matter and no further action will be taken. The original signed statement will be kept on your student file and a copy will be forwarded to Student Conduct & Appeals for monitoring purposes and for future reference should you commit plagiarism/collusion again. Please note that any subsequent offences will be considered under the formal procedures of the College’s G27 Misconduct Regulations.

The College’s module on KEATS about Referencing & Understanding Plagiarism will provide detailed information on plagiarism and how to avoid it. The module can be accessed via the ‘Getting Started at King’s’ section of the KLaSS landing page.

You are also reminded to familiarise yourself with the College’s Academic Honesty & Integrity Policy and the Student Guide on Academic Honesty & Integrity, which are available on the Student Conduct and Appeals webpages. If you are in any doubt about the appropriate use of source material or academic writing please contact your personal tutor for guidance.

For clarification on any aspect of this matter you may contact Student Conduct & Appeals on 020 7848 3989 or e-mail appeals@kcl.ac.uk.

Yours sincerely

[XXXX]
Chair of the [xxxx] Assessment Board

cc.appeals@kcl.ac.uk

10 “assessment” is for students studying at Level 6 and below and “module” is for students studying at Level 7 and above.
Appendix F

Standard plagiarism/collusion acknowledgement statement  Outcome of a Plagiarism/Collusion

Interview: Statement of Acknowledgement

Student Name: .......................................................................................... Student Number: .................................................................
Programme: ..............................................................................................
Module Code: ...........................................................................................
Assessment title: ........................................................................................

The outcome of the Plagiarism/Collusion interview is (delete as appropriate):

- I hereby acknowledge that the above assessment constitutes plagiarism and that I am therefore guilty of examination misconduct.
- I hereby acknowledge that the above assessment constitutes collusion with ................................................ and that I am therefore guilty of examination misconduct.

I understand that:

i) My case has been dealt with in accordance with the agreed Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP);
ii) It was made clear to me that I have the option to contest the allegations, however I freely admit to the examination misconduct;
iii) I will be awarded a mark of zero for this assessment/module [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE];
iv) This record will remain on my file.

The original signed statement should be retained on the student's file; one copy should be sent to the student with the confirmation letter, and a further copy sent to Student Conduct & Appeals (appeals@kcl.ac.uk).

Or

- The Examiners have found there to be poor academic practice in your work. You will receive no penalty, and your work will be returned to the Examiners for marking on its merits. A copy of this form will be held on your file, any further instances of plagiarism/collusion will be escalated to a Misconduct Committee for consideration as major plagiarism/collusion.

Or

- The Examiners acknowledge that there is no evidence of plagiarism/collusion and therefore no case to answer, your work will be returned to the Examiners for marking. A copy of this form will not be held on your file.

Student signature:.................................................................

Date:.................................................................

---
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Programme Board Chair’s signature: ................................................

Date: ................................................

*In instances where the outcome is ‘no case to answer’ the student should receive a copy of the signed statement only and a copy should not be held on his/her file.*
Appendix G

Email Template for Students who have failed to attend a meeting under LAMP

Dear XXXXX,

I am writing further to my emails of [DATE] and [DATE] requesting that you attend a meeting under Local Academic Misconduct Procedure (LAMP) on (DATE) and (DATE) to discuss a possible case of plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE].

As you failed to attend both of these meetings a decision has been made in your absence that you have committed the offence of plagiarism/collusion [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE] in an assessed piece of work submitted by you as part of Module [MODULE NAME + CODE].

You have therefore been awarded the penalty of zero for this assessment/module [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE] with the right to resubmit not withdrawn (if resubmission is eligible).

If you want to contest this decision please email me within 5 working days stating that you wish to do this and the matter will be referred to Student Conduct & Appeals for formal proceedings to be started under the College’s Misconduct Regulations. Please note that contestations submitted after this time will not be considered unless there are exceptional circumstances. A successful contestation is likely to result in a full hearing of your case by the College’s Misconduct Committee. Please note that if you are found guilty of plagiarism/collusion, [DELETE AS APPROPRIATE] the Misconduct Committee has a far wider range of penalties available to it than the penalty available under LAMP.

If you do not contest the decision within 5 working days you will be awarded the above penalty.

For clarification on any aspect of this matter you may contact the Student Conduct & Appeals on 020 7848 3989, or e-mail appeals@kcl.ac.uk. You may also wish to contact the KCLSU Advice Service on 020 7848 4588 or www.kclsu.org/adviceform.

Yours sincerely,

XXXX
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College guidance for staff on academic honesty and integrity
College Policy on student feedback on assessment

Feedback is at the core of learning and teaching in the College. In its simplest form feedback is a conversation between student and teacher. The feedback you obtain will come in many different forms, both formal and informal, including assessment grades, comments on work, conversations with tutors, notes to an entire class, and discussion with other students. Feedback on summative written work (such as exam papers or coursework assignments) is the most common type of formal feedback you can expect to receive. However, it is equally applicable to other assessed activities such as when you are on a placement, in a laboratory, on a field trip, a ward or giving a presentation or performance.

Whatever form your feedback takes, it is a valuable tool in ensuring your next relevant piece of work/activity is better. Feedback aims to be insightful, critical, and enabling: an exercise in learning rather than a quantitative measure of how well you have done in your last piece of work.

It is College Policy that each Faculty/Department will have its own subject specific marking criteria that will be framed by the College’s generic marking criteria. Feedback on assessments should, where appropriate, make reference to the Faculty/College marking criteria.

Feedback occurs at all times throughout degrees in both formal and informal settings. This College policy addresses only feedback provided in relation to assessments.

The College recognises the importance of timely feedback in the following policy:

Coursework Assignments
• To communicate the deadline, by which all feedback will be delivered, normally this will be no longer than four weeks\(^1\) from the submission deadline (excluding College closure days and public holidays)
• To deliver written feedback promptly, while students still have a clear recollection of the assignment just tackled;
• To ensure students are able to benefit from their feedback and use it for upcoming assessment tasks;
• To provide feedback in sufficient detail to enable students to understand how future, similar work might be improved

Unseen written examinations
• To provide students with a copy, if requested, of examination scripts once provisional results have been published.
• The release of examination scripts and feedback following the summer examination period and the August reassessment period may be delayed.
• To communicate the deadline, by which the examination scripts will be made available, normally this will be no longer than 14 days after the request
• To deliver feedback promptly, while students still have a clear recollection of the examination just tackled;
• To include a breakdown of where marks have been awarded, such as for MCQs or short

---

\(^1\) Some forms of assessment such as dissertations, a taped case study, audio visual submissions, final laboratory reports etc. may require longer
College Policy on student feedback on assessment

answer questions;

- To provide, if requested, specific individual feedback (via the personal tutor or subject tutor) on unseen written examination, as per published faculty practice.
- To provide students with generic feedback on unseen written examinations; this might include:
  - on a question-by-question basis;
  - the cohort’s distribution of marks;
  - a short narrative highlighting the features of favourable and less favourable student answers / responses;
College key principles to effective assessment feedback

Effective feedback is:

Constructive ~ recognising strengths as well as weaknesses
Feedback often concentrates on correcting errors, but it should also encourage students to understand what they have done right. Apart from the obvious benefits to students’ morale and motivation, this helps them gain a full appreciation of why they did well, and what constitutes good work.

Forward looking
It is recommended that a formative opportunity should precede a summative item of assessment, particularly in years one and two of undergraduate programmes. This provides a ‘feed-forward’ opportunity for students to understand what is expected of them on subsequent summative assignments.

Timely
To be effective, feedback must be delivered promptly, while students still have a clear recollection of the assignment just tackled, and so that it can feed forward into the next assignment.

Comprehensible
A student needs to understand feedback; it should be clear and unambiguous. In certain contexts a glossary to explain any technical terminology may help a student’s understanding.

Relevant
Feedback should, wherever possible, be related to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria for the task so that students are aware of what is expected of them.

Encouraging
A student needs to know from the feedback they receive what they must do in future to improve the work that contributes to their degree.

Delivering feedback
The importance of delivering timely and effective feedback means that a range of methods, appropriate to the different forms of assessment, are required. Traditionally, feedback is often associated with a one-on-one scenario with individual written comments, but there are other, equally effective (and often less time-consuming), methods of providing feedback:

◆ Generic feedback ~ is useful for going over assignments and exam questions, highlighting the areas that were generally good and those that were not;
◆ Model answers ~ particularly useful for examination feedback;
◆ Group feedback ~ particularly useful in conjunction with model answers;
◆ Feedback sheets with marking criteria explained ~ what is required to achieve particular grades;
◆ Handout sheets ~ useful for summarising the areas covered in generic feedback;
◆ Self-assessment ~ useful for improving a student’s use of self-reflection;
◆ Peer assessment ~ encourages students to learn from each other and to use the
discourse of the subject to promote a more independent approach to learning;

- Chair side or bench-side feedback ~ particularly useful for clinical or practical situations as the feedback can be delivered almost immediately;
- Other options such as electronic and audio methods are effective too, and can improve the timeliness of the feedback.
Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR)

3. What is the HEAR?

1.1. The HEAR is an initiative developed following a report (Beyond the Honours Degree Classification) produced by the Measuring and Recording Student Achievement Steering Group, in 2007. The report concluded that the development of the HEAR would assist in providing a richer record of student activity, as well as modernising the traditional degree classification system.

1.2. The HEAR provides students with detailed information about their learning and achievement to supplement the traditional degree classification and standard transcript.

4. Section 6.1

2.1. Section 6.1 of the Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) covers achievements by the student not directly related to calculation of their degree result. These achievements must be verified by the College.

3. Criteria for Approval

3.1. Currently, Achievements eligible for 6.1 must:

a. Demonstrate a student’s commitment, skill, ability or knowledge in an activity undertaken under the auspices of King’s College London or KCLSU;

b. Be verifiable by a Programme Assessment Sub-board or delegated committee or office;

c. Be verified before students have completed their academic programme. Final HEAR’s will be issued to graduating students shortly after their final Exam Board. The date of the Board will be the final date for inclusion and verification of items;

d. Not be a direct part of the academic curriculum (reflected in section 4.3 of the HEAR);

e. Be available to all students (a) at the College or (b) on a specific academic programme, or (c) within a specific Department or School; with the exception of certain representative roles which may be restricted to ensure democratic representation of the student population as a whole;

f. Not overlap with an accredited achievement already recorded in 4.3 or with other achievements listed in section 6.1;

g. The unit within King’s College London proposing the new item is able to undertake its administration. This will involve approving and / or verifying the achievement, maintaining an audit trail and adding the details of the achievers via Student Records.

h. The activity should be advertised to all eligible students in advance. At a minimum this will consist of it being listed on the HEAR webpages.

4. Examples of items

4.1. Examples of items that may be included in section 6.1 are defined below;

- Prizes: A prize is something (usually a cash sum) given to an enrolled student in recognition of a specific academic achievement while studying at the College;

- Associateship of King’s College: The award granted by College on completion of the Associateship of King’s College London programme;

- King’s Awards: Awards made by the College for study taken outside of their taught programmes, including the King’s Experience Awards (e.g. King’s Experience Global Award) and Leadership & Professional Skills Awards;

- KCLSU office holder: An elected sabbatical officer of the King’s College London Students’ Union;
• **Active in KCLSU societies or sports clubs:** A demonstrably active role within a society or sports club beyond membership of the club, for example as President or Treasurer;

• **Working as student ambassador:** Completion of a task or period of time as an appointed ambassador of the College, for example at induction or graduation events;

• **Student representation:** Acting as an elected representative of students, for example as a Student-Staff Liaison Committee representative;

• **Active in official departmental student societies:** A demonstrably active role within a society, established by a department, beyond the membership of the club, for example as President or Treasurer;

• **Work related experience:** An internship or placement opportunity organised by the College that enables students to apply their academic instruction in a real working environment that is taken outside of their taught programme (e.g. Global Internships Programme);

• **Scholarships:** A scholarship is a financial award made to a student, often at the beginning of their programme, on the basis of academic merit.

5. **Process for “adding” an item to section 6.1**

5.1. The process for adding an item will be as follows:

➢ the Faculty (Institute/ School) or relevant division approves the proposal to add a new item via either its Programme Assessment Sub-Board or relevant Faculty (Institute/ School) Committee;

➢ the proposer sends details of the achievement to hear@kcl.ac.uk, who advise the Quality, Standards and Enhancement office (QSE). Information provided should include the title of the achievement, the description, how the achievement will be advertised to students and who will be responsible for approving or verifying the achievement;

➢ QSE checks the details of the proposal against the HEAR criteria to confirm the achievement can be included in section 6.1 of the HEAR;

➢ once the new item has been confirmed for inclusion in section 6.1, the Student Data Quality team (mailto:hear@kcl.ac.uk) will create either a GAT or MAV record on SITS, advising QSE and the Faculty (Institute/ School)/ department) of this addition to the system;

➢ once the relevant section (e.g. Faculty Board) has confirmed which student is to be awarded the item the Faculty/ Department or relevant division allocates the item to the student via e:vision student records (HEAR Achievement Management process);

➢ Where a proposal is made to add a prize to the system, the proposer should ensure that the College Prizes book managed by the Graduation and Ceremonies team has been updated prior to the request being submitted to the HEAR team.

6. **Reporting mechanism**

6.1. An annual report will be submitted to the College Assessment and Standards Sub-Committee on the use of section 6.1.

---

1 Where a Division is not able to get access to student records on e: vision they should contact the Student Data Quality team for support.
Section N
Templates and forms
Templates and forms

The following templates and forms are available:

Programme Development and Approval Sub-Committee
- Initial Programme Proposal form
- Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/governance/committees/ab-sub-committees/pdasc

Programme and module approval and modification
- Templates for business and marketing plans
- Programme approval form: taught programmes
- Module approval form
- Modification form
- Template for student placement
- Major/minor modification table
  https://internal.kcl.ac.uk/about/governance/Prog-Approval-Resources/Programme-Module-Approval-Resources

Collaborative provision
- Collaborative Collaborative Activity Risk Assessment Tool
- Template for a Memorandum of Understanding
- Template for a Memorandum of Agreement (incorporating the Activity Schedule)
- Template for Review of Activity (prior to re-signing a Memorandum of Understanding and related Agreements)
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/collaborative-provision/collabprov

Programme and module monitoring and review
- Programme Enhancement Template
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/reviewandmonitoring/index

External peers and external specialists
- External peers nomination form
- External peers and specialists financial forms
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/extspecialistspeers

Postgraduate research degrees
- Programme approval form: research programmes
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/prog/approvalandmod/resprogapproval

External Examiners
- External examiner nomination form
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/nomination
- External examiner extension to contract form
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/nomination
- External Examiners UG/PGT report form, which includes the sections for responding back to the report
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/report
- External Examiner financial forms
  https://www.kcl.ac.uk/aboutkings/quality/academic/external/payment