

Queen Mary University of London Risk framework for Faculty Approval Collaborative Activities

Risk Identification

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement	Central repository for signed agreements
<p><u>Articulation agreement</u></p> <p><i>Admission to an intermediate stage of a UG Queen Mary programme as defined in the Academic Regulations on the basis of the recognition of Level 4 study at the partner institution to an agreed standard, which counts as advanced standing credit on the student's academic record.</i></p>	Low risk	<p>1) University reputation</p> <p>3) Curriculum mapping (international universities)</p> <p>4) Amendment / waiving of Queen Mary entry requirements</p> <p>5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version</p> <p>11) Volume of activity</p>	Faculty (Faculty may defer to Partnerships Board for proposals it deems higher risk)	Faculty VP	Global Engagement Office

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement	Central repository for signed agreements
<p><u>Faculty to Faculty Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)</u></p> <p><i>Document to indicate intention by faculty and their counterpart to explore the possibilities for collaboration in the future. Non legally-binding.</i></p>	Low risk	<p>1) University reputation</p> <p>2) Organisation reputation</p> <p>5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version</p>	Faculty (Faculty may defer to Partnerships Board for proposals it deems higher risk)	Faculty VP, VP (International) or VP (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)	ARCS
<p><u>Medical electives</u></p> <p><i>Outgoing medical students undertaking electives as a requirement of the MBBS programme</i></p>	Low risk	<p>1) University reputation</p> <p>2) Organisation reputation</p> <p>7) Quality of pastoral / academic support</p> <p>8) Location of activity (international)</p>	Faculty (Faculty may defer to Partnerships Board for proposals it deems higher risk)	Faculty VP	SMD

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement	Central repository for signed agreements
<u>Progression agreement</u> <i>Progression arrangements set out the requirements for admission to the start of a Queen Mary degree programme following completion of studies at a partner institution.</i>	Low risk	1) University Reputation 3) Curriculum mapping to QM raises concerns 4) Amendment / waiving of Queen Mary entry requirements 5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version 11) Volume of activity	Faculty (Faculty may defer to Partnerships Board for proposals it deems higher risk)	Faculty VP or VP (International)	GEO
<u>Staff Exchange Agreement</u> <i>Staff undertaking short periods (less than one semester) of mobility at partners such as guest lectures</i>	Low risk	1) University reputation 2) Organisation reputation 5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version 6) Ownership of IP is in question 8) Location of activity (international)	Faculty (Faculty may defer to Partnerships Board for proposals it deems higher risk)	Faculty VP, VP (International) or VP (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)	GEO

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement	Central repository for signed agreements
<u>Student Exchange Agreements</u> <i>Incoming and outgoing students taking credit at the other institution which counts towards their degree at their home institution. Numbers sent / received should be equal and fees are waived on both sides.</i>	Low risk	1) University reputation 4) Amendment / waiving of Queen Mary entry requirements 5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version 8) Quality of pastoral / academic support 9) Location of activity (international) 10) Dependency on specific module/programme Availability 11) Volume of activity	Faculty (Faculty may defer to Partnerships Board for proposals it deems higher risk)	Faculty VP or VP (International)	GEO
<u>Summer School Recruitment</u> <i>Agreement with partners to send groups to participate in summer schools</i>	Low Risk	1) University reputation	Partnerships Board (Faculties to have reviewed and approved first)	Principal, VP (International) or VP (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)	GEO

Activity type	Default risk category	Risk escalation triggers (see Risk Explanation and Mitigation table)	Approval Body	Authorised signatory for agreement	Central repository for signed agreements
<u>Study Abroad agreements</u> <i>Incoming fee-paying students taking credit at Queen Mary which counts towards their degree at the partner.</i>	Low risk	1) University reputation 2) Amendment / waiving of Queen Mary entry requirements 5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version 10) Dependency on specific module/programme availability	Partnerships Board (Faculties to have reviewed and approved first)	Principal, VP (International) or VP (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)	GEO
<u>University level Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)</u> <i>Document to indicate intention on both sides to explore possibility for collaboration in the future. Non legally-binding.</i>	Low risk	1) University reputation 2) Organisation reputation 5) Use of alternative template to standard Queen Mary version	Partnerships Board (Faculties to have reviewed and approved first)	Principal, VP (International) or VP (Policy and Strategic Partnerships)	ARCS

Risk Explanation and Mitigations

Risk number	Risk name	Risk Description	Potential mitigating actions	Escalation to Partnerships Board
1)	University Reputation	<p>University is low ranked or not ranked in Times Higher or QS Reputations (including subject specific Reputations)</p> <p>Working with low-Reputation or non-Reputation universities may have reputational risks as well as standards and quality issues if the proposal relates to activities like exchanges, progression agreements or programmes leading to an award.</p>	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>Faculty is satisfied that university is well-established or specialises in subject area of agreement</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>National Reputations for country indicate university is well-ranked</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>Working with the university is a strategic decision to support agreed internal objectives or to align with external policy drivers (e.g. governmental, regulatory)</p>	None of the mitigations are applicable but proposer would like to proceed.
2)	Organisation reputation	<p>There are concerns relating to the proposed partner in relation to any of the following: funding sources, political influence, regulatory body registration or regulatory changes, press reports on aspects of organisation's business or researcher integrity (for research-related proposals).</p> <p>Ethical Partnerships Policy should be referred to.</p>	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>Issues are historic</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>It is a multi-national company and proposed activity is with a separate section from where issue has arisen</p> <p>And / Or</p>	There are concerns when evaluating the the potential benefits and risks to Queen Mary.

			Faculty is satisfied that benefits of partnership outweigh potential negative impacts. (Marketing & Communications should be informed of any partnerships which may draw negative attention so they can prepare to address queries.)	
3)	Curriculum Mapping (international universities)	<p>Curriculum mapping has not taken place, is incomplete or indicates that education standards are not equivalent to Queen Mary.</p> <p>For exchanges, curriculum mapping should also include grade conversion. If this has not been done, Queen Mary risks complaints from students in relation to lack of grade information in advance and/or complaints about the transferred grade when returning to QM.</p>	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>Checks with NARIC or the British Council (with support from Global Engagement Office) show that standards are equivalent to UK expectations</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>School/institute is prepared to provide extra support to students if required</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>University is based in USA, China, Brazil (+ others) where Global Engagement Office has comprehensive information on the national education system and can confirm standards</p>	There are still concerns about the education standards of the partner
4)	Amendment / waiving of Queen Mary entry requirements	Partner asks for standard entry requirements either academic or English Language to be amended or waived.	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>Amended entry requirements have been discussed and agreed with the school/institute and Admissions</p>	Faculty is concerned amendments requested are not acceptable

		<p>This raises risks in relation to quality and incoming students' abilities to manage the course.</p> <p>Schools/ institutes may wish to offer a lower entry requirement but this would be at their own risk.</p> <p>English language requirements for overseas students cannot be waived.</p>	<p>And / or</p> <p>School/institute is prepared to provide extra support to students if required</p> <p>And / or</p> <p>Students can join a pre-sessional English course to improve English language scores to meet required standards</p>	
5)	Use of alternative document to standard Queen Mary template	<p>Partner wishes to use own agreement template or make significant adjustments to the Queen Mary standard template</p> <p>Memorandums of Understanding are not legally binding documents in the UK but may be in other countries. The addition of legally-binding clauses to a MoU may be problematic for Queen Mary and advice should be sought from ARCS. If the partner adds text (particularly in relation to IP or financing commitments), this will be problematic for this type of agreement and ARCS should be consulted.</p>	<p>This may be acceptable if:</p> <p>The alternative document covers the areas of the QM template and matches (but does not exceed) the commitments QM is prepared to undertake</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>Advice has been sought from ARCS in regard to the template or altered text.</p>	Faculty is concerned about the commitments required of Queen Mary

		For other agreements, it is not possible to omit /remove references to the UK Bribery Act 2010, GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 and Freedom of Information Act 2000. Changes to indemnity or liability clauses are also to be avoided without legal and financial advice. Changes to Intellectual Property clauses should be checked against Queen Mary's IP Policy and discussed with ARCS.		
6)	Ownership of IP is in question	Queen Mary templates will include our standard IP position. Any changes to this would need discussion to ensure our IP rights are protected. This would be particularly critical if the IP was exploitable and may require advice from the IP committee and/or lawyers.	May be acceptable if: IP change is advantageous to Queen Mary And / Or IP has been discussed / agreed with ARCS (if necessary IP Committee will be asked to review and approve)	Faculty has concerns Queen Mary's IP is not protected
7)	Requires financial commitment of resources	It should be clear whether there are any financial commitments and how these will be met from either existing resources or future budgets as well as the funding duration. On occasion, signing an MoU is required before funding	May be acceptable if: Faculty is assured that the school has sufficient resource in place to meet funding requirements or has a budget plan that will allow it to do so And / or	Faculty has concerns funding commitments are not deliverable or will require resource from outside its remit.

		applications can be made that would support activities. Care needs to taken to ensure that if there is a dependency between funding and activities to be delivered this is clearly expressed.	The funding commitments are proportionate to the activity being undertaken	
8)	Quality of pastoral / academic support	Queen Mary has a duty of care to its students whether studying on campus or elsewhere as part of their degree. Failure to ensure that students receive satisfactory pastoral and academic support could lead to complaints. In particular, Queen Mary needs to ensure that students with disabilities have the correct support in place at partners.	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>School/institute (or GEO) has confirmed partner will provide the level of support expected for Queen Mary students</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>There is a named member of staff that students can contact with concerns</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>School / institute has contingency plans if students are not willing to continue at provider</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>Specific support packages for students with disabilities have been agreed with the partner</p>	Faculty has concerns support available is insufficient
9)	Location of activity (international)	For international partners, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO)	May be acceptable if:	

		<p>advice should always be checked. FCO advisories against travel to countries or specific areas should be heeded.</p> <p>Even if there are no FCO issues, consideration must be given to the cultural, social and political environments of the country e.g. laws about homosexuality which may impact on students and staff.</p> <p>Queen Mary travel insurance may not cover some countries / activities or additional coverage may be required. This should be checked before travel.</p> <p>Queen Mary has a duty of care to its staff and students whilst they are undertaking activities in relation to their programme or their employment.</p>	<p>Faculty is satisfied that staff or students will be fully informed of any cultural / social / political factors that are different to the UK so they can make an informed decision on whether to participate</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>The travel / activity is covered by the appropriate insurance (travel and liability if necessary)</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>There are contingency plans to remove staff/students if necessary</p>	
10)	Dependency on specific module/programme availability	<p>Partner requires that specific modules or programmes are made available to their students as part of the agreement.</p> <p>Guaranteeing specific access may be problematic as this may cause issues in future years if there is increased internal demand in these</p>	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>The faculty is satisfied that there is capacity to accommodate these students on the requested modules / programmes</p> <p>And / Or</p>	N/A – faculty is best-placed to reach decisions on finance and resources.

		<p>areas. However, this may be advantageous if modules / programmes have low recruitment numbers or capacity to grow.</p>	<p>Offering these places will not affect delivery to existing / future Queen Mary students on degree programmes.</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>This can be managed within existing financial, staff, space and resource levels</p>	
11)	Volume of activity	<p>The numbers proposed for each activity should be considered. Numbers for an individual activity may be low but there could be a cumulative effect if a several agreements have been signed and the commitments made have to be met during similar timescales.</p>	<p>May be acceptable if:</p> <p>The faculty is satisfied that there is existing capacity to accommodate these students on the programme(s)</p> <p>And / Or</p> <p>The faculty is satisfied that these numbers have been accounted for in financial, staff, space and resource planning.</p>	<p>N/A – faculty is best-placed to reach decisions on finance and resources.</p>