

**PROPOSED PARTNER: RISK ASSESSMENT**

**[INSERT NAME]**

**For initial evaluation of new full-cost collaborations**

**[1 = low risk; 3 = medium risk; 5 = high risk]**

**A. THE CONTEXT**

* **Language of Instruction**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UK or English first language | 1 |
| UK based, English second language | 2 |
| European based, English second language | 4 |
| Overseas (other than Europe), English second language | 5 |

* **Educational Culture**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| UK | 1 |
| Commonwealth | 2 |
| European | 4 |
| Other | 5 |

* **Safety of Host Country** (with reference to FCO Travel Advice). This section is subject to continual monitoring; it will be revisited if a major incident occurs in Host Country/Region.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | No advice issued against travel in Host Country | | 1 |
| |  | | --- | | Advice issued against travel near region in which proposed partner is based | | 2 |
| Advice issued against travel in region in which proposed partner is based | 4 |
| |  | | --- | | Advice issued against all travel in Host Country/Region | | 5 |

* **Host Country’s Political and Social Climate (1)** (with reference to Corruption Perception Index: <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results>)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CPI 75-100 | 1 |
| CPI 50-74 | 2 |
| CPI 25-49 | 4 |
| CPI 0-24 | 5 |

* **Host Country’s Political and Social Climate (2)** (with reference to the BSCI Countries Risk Classification: <http://www.bsci-intl.org/resource/countries-risk-classification>)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Average rating 81-100 | 1 |
| Average rating 61-80 | 2 |
| Average rating 41- 60 | 3 |
| Average rating 21-40 | 4 |
| Average rating 0 - 20 | 5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-total =** |  |

**B. THE PROPOSED PARTNER**

* **Status**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Large HEI (public or private, govt. approved/supported) | 1 |
| Publicly funded FE College | 2 |
| Small private college/organisation | 4 |
| Non-educational institution | 5 |

* **Resources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Well-resourced *large* institution | 1 |
| Well-resourced *small* institution | 3 |
| Limited | 5 |

* **Prior experience of collaboration with UK (or other) HEIs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| At this level | 1 |
| At lower level | 3 |
| None | 5 |

* **HE ‘ambience’ for our students**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| N/A as not sending students to partner | 1 |
| Many programmes/students at this level | 2 |
| Some programmes/students at this level | 4 |
| No other programmes/students at this level | 5 |

* **For Profit**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No | 3 |
| Yes | 5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-total =** |  |

**C. THE PROPOSED PROGRAMME**

* **Collaborative ‘history’**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| N/A as only exchange is proposed | 1 |
| Established collaborative programme | 2 |
| Established on campus only | 4 |
| New programme | 5 |

* **Credit level**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level 0 | 1 |
| Level 1, 2 | 2 |
| Level 3, M | 4 |
| PGR | 5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-total =** |  |

**D. DELIVERY MODEL**

* **Student Learning Experience**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Partner as administrative support centre *(i.e. local centre only provides premises, IT facilities, etc.)* | 1 |
| Partner as learner support centre*(‘supported collaboration’ - learner materials and/or local tutoring based on materials and task defined by Brunel)* | 3 |
| Partner as Teaching Centre*(‘delegated collaboration’ - all or most teaching and tutoring delegated to partner)* | 5 |

* **Control of Outcome Standards** (in addition to external examiner scrutiny)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Most assessment set and marked (or second marked) by Brunel | 1 |
| Assessment shared | 3 |
| Most assessment delegated to partner | 5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sub-total =** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TOTAL =** |  |

**Overall Risk Scores**

**< 27 = Low**

**28 – 42 = Medium**

**43 – 56 = High**

**57 – 70 = Very High**

*NOTES:*

*1.*     *The overall total score of any proposal will lie between 7 (min) and 30 (max), with a ‘rule of thumb’ range of <15 regarded as ‘low risk’; 16-21 as ‘medium risk’; and 22-30 as ‘high risk’.*

*2.*     *The ‘delivery model’ is regarded as a particularly significant factor in the assessment of risk, so particular attention is paid to this section*

*3.*     *Other checks/factors to consider:*

*-*     *views of any local accreditation agency and/or British Council*

*-*     *any local legislation about collaboration*

*-*     *general ‘fit’ with University/College collaborative strategy*

*-*     *existing or potential geographical ‘node’*

*-*     *existing or potential multi-disciplinary partner*

*-*     *any internal university issues (e.g. re-structuring)*

*-*     *host Department’s track record on quality*

*-*     *other latent benefits, (research/consultancy opportunities, staff development, curriculum development, contribution to community need etc.)*