

**Guidance BG(ii)**  
Liaison Document Guidelines

**Faculty of [ ]**

**[Field]**

**[Collaborative partner]**

**LIAISON DOCUMENT**

**[Validation date]**

# Guidance BG(ii)

## Liaison Document Guidelines

### 1 Introduction

Brief paragraph providing background to the collaboration and setting out the purpose of the liaison document

### 2 Liaison roles

List of the key individuals involved in the collaboration, including the Field Leader/Liaison Officer at KU and corresponding Field Leader/Liaison Officer at the partner, and outline of their main responsibilities in relation to the collaborative partnership.

For franchised provision, there should be regular liaison between module leaders at Kingston University and their counterparts at the partner institution. For validated provision where there is subject cognisance, subject-level liaison should be through the Liaison Officer if this individual is a specialist in the relevant subject area. If the liaison co-ordinator is not a subject specialist, the faculty should nominate an additional representative with expertise in the subject area for the purposes of subject-level liaison. Guidance on the role of the Liaison Officers is provided in guidance BG(i).

### 3 Liaison bodies

Description of the committees and groups which will relate to the collaboration, including Boards of Study, Staff-Student Consultative Committees, Assessment Boards, Executive Committees and other groups as appropriate. The membership, role, frequency of meetings and reporting lines of each group should be noted.

*Executive Committee:*

For franchised and validated provision, an Executive Committee, as defined in the Institutional Agreement, should be established to review annually the operation of the partnership. See guidance BG(iii) for Terms of Reference and membership of Executive Committees and Guidance BG(vii) for standard agenda items for Executive Committees

*Boards of Study:*

For franchised provision, these should be sub-boards of the in-house or “parent” Board of Study. A faculty representative should attend the sub-board, and a partner representative should attend the “parent” board. For validated provision, these should be separate boards (*ie*: not reporting into a parent board at the University), but a faculty representative should attend the board.

# Guidance BG(ii)

## Liaison Document Guidelines

### *Assessment Boards:*

For franchised and validated provision, these should be attended by module leaders from the partner and Chaired by a senior member of staff from the faculty (normally Head of School or equivalent).

#### **4 Learning and teaching**

Description of the ways in which learning and teaching strategies will support comparability of standards and student experience between the collaborative provision and that offered on-site by the University.

#### **5 Annual monitoring**

Description of how annual monitoring will operate in relation to the collaborative provision.

### *Annual Review and Development Plans:*

For franchised and validated provision, these should normally be written by partner staff, with guidance from faculty staff. All Module Review and Development Plans (MRDPs) for franchised and validated provision, should be considered by the Head of School or equivalent. For franchised programmes, and validated programmes where there is close subject cognisance, MRDPs should be considered at the relevant Board of Study (BoS) in the faculty. For certain validated programmes where there is limited subject cognisance, MRDPs should be considered at the BoS at the partner. The meeting should be attended by a faculty representative (normally the Liaison Officer or equivalent).

The Liaison Document should identify who in the partner is responsible for writing the MRDP, and who at the partner is responsible for reviewing the MRDP in relation to institution-level issues such as resources.

#### **6 Assessment**

Description of the ways in which assessment arrangements, including the setting and moderation of assessed work and examination papers, will support comparability of standards and student experience between the collaborative provision and that offered on-site by the University.

### *Scrutiny of coursework and examinations:*

For franchised and validated provision, (including provision that is delivered and/or assessed in a language other than English), this should normally be carried out by faculty staff. For certain validated programmes where there is limited subject cognisance within the faculty, the faculty may wish to propose that exam paper scrutiny is carried out by external examiners rather than by faculty staff. In these instances, a case should be made for this in the Liaison Document

# Guidance BG(ii)

## Liaison Document Guidelines

at validation. On advice from the Chair and Validation Officer, the validation panel will have the authority to decide whether the faculty's proposed variation to the quality assurance processes in this respect is appropriate.

### *Moderation of student work:*

For franchised provision, this should be carried out by faculty staff. For validated provision, moderation should be carried out by the University for the first two years of the partnership, after which the Faculty may agree at its quality committee that this may be done by the partner, if there is confidence as a result of external examiners' reports, annual review and development plans etc. This two year time period can be reduced at the point of validation if deemed appropriate by the validation panel. For certain validated programmes where there is limited subject cognisance within the faculty, the faculty may wish to propose that internal moderation should be carried out by partner staff from the outset. If the faculty wishes to propose that moderation is carried out by partner staff from the outset, or that moderation should be carried out by the University for less than two years, a case should be made in the Liaison Document at validation. On advice from the Chair and Validation Officer, the validation panel will have the authority to decide whether the faculty's proposed variation to the quality assurance processes in this respect is appropriate.

## **7 External examiner arrangements**

Description of the arrangements for external examination and assessment boards. Where a course is a franchised one, *ie.* the same course as that offered on-site at the University, it is expected that at least one of the external examiner(s) will be the same to ensure comparability of standards.

### *External examiner reports:*

All external examiner reports, for franchised and validated provision, should be considered by the Head of School (or equivalent) as well as by the relevant Board of Studies. Responses to external examiners' reports for validated and franchised provision should be written in liaison with the faculty. See section I for further information on external examiner reports.

## **8 Staff development**

This section should include a staff development plan which describes how the team intends to foster a mutual understanding of standards and quality of the student experience and understanding of the University's requirements and procedures. It should cover the following topics:

- [Where partner staff have little or no prior experience of teaching and assessing at the level of the award]: Strategy for ensuring that delivery and assessment of the field is at an appropriate level (for example, give details

# Guidance BG(ii)

## Liaison Document Guidelines

of plans for partner staff shadowing/observing University staff; sharing examples of assessed work; joint double marking; moderation etc)

- Indication of how partner staff will be inducted into the University's academic and quality assurance and enhancement processes, including assessment boards, boards of study, staff-student consultative committees, the external examining process and the annual review and development process (particularly completion of annual review and development plans)
- Indication of how partner staff will be made aware of the national higher education quality assurance framework, specifically the QAA Academic Infrastructure (*ie.* the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, Programme Specifications, Subject Benchmark Statements and Code of Practice)
- Strategy for involving partner staff in Blackboard training, teaching and learning events, and, where appropriate, enrolment on the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (this may be done in conjunction with the Academic Development Centre)
- Any other planned staff development activities for the partnership

### **9 Administrative liaison**

Description of the ways in which administrative arrangements will support liaison between the partners.

### **10 Pastoral support**

Description of welfare, counselling and other support available to students at the collaborative partner.

### **11 Student opinions and feedback**

Description of the mechanisms for the collection of student opinions

### **12 Publicity information**

Clarification of who is responsible for checking the accuracy of publicity information in relation to the course. (Guidance on promotional materials for collaborative provision can be found in guidance BG (vi)).

# Guidance BG(ii)

## Liaison Document Guidelines

### 13 Operational Calendar (optional)

The following list shows some (but not necessarily all) of the key events which Liaison Officers may wish to include in an Operational Calendar. The Calendar should be updated prior to the start of each academic year.

It may be helpful to differentiate between tasks that must be completed annually, or each semester.

- staff development events
- applications and interviews
- enrolment and registration
- induction and teaching weeks
- setting, marking and local moderation of assessment
- submission of assessed work for KU moderation
- Boards of Study, Executive Committees, Staff-Student Consultative Committees etc.
- completion of Module Review and Development Plans
- examinations
- transmission of marks to KU
- assessment boards

#### Example:

DATE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBILITY	NOTES
	Staff Development		
	Interviews		
	Induction		
	Board of Study 1		
	Staff-student Consultative Committee 1		
	Moderation of assessment		