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**Design and Delivery Framework**

**The Roehampton Academic Offer: The Delivery Framework for Undergraduate Programmes**

**Introduction**

This delivery framework should be used in the design and development of all new undergraduate programmes, as well as in the review and revalidation of existing programmes during periodic review. It should be read alongside the Quality Code, in particular, part B on assuring and enhancing academic quality.[[1]](#footnote-1) The framework sets out certain important aspects of how we should delivery programmes at Roehampton as part of our academic offer to students. The aims of the framework are: to create a more consistent Roehampton academic offer; to underpin fairness for students across all programmes (wherever the course is delivered); to ensure that programmes are delivered in an efficient and effective way; and to contribute to transparent and fair workload allocations. Programmes not currently going through revalidation should be working towards complying with this framework.

**The framework**

1. The standard module, including option modules, is 20 credits (or multiples of).
2. As standard practice, programmes should be designed around six 20 credit semester-long modules each year. At level 6, it is likely that dissertations and other independent study modules will be run as year-long 40 credit modules. Curriculum design may integrate for learning and teaching purposes semester-long 20 credit modules into notional year-long 40 credit modules but the two parts of the module are best left as discrete 20 credit modules for registration and assessment purposes.
3. Programmes should be designed in such a way as to allow students to opt for study abroad in year 2 (semester or year-long) as part of a broader internationalisation of the curriculum.
4. Generally, no module should run with fewer than 20 students. Programmes should minimise the likelihood of modules running with fewer than 20 students by managing optionality as part of their annual cycle of programme monitoring and review.
5. The sabbatical rota allows the advanced planning of teaching by staff on research leave. If a module has to be ‘rested’ because of research leave, then this should be communicated to students at least one year in advance.
6. In normal circumstances, student numbers on modules should not be capped.
7. The curriculum design of programmes should follow from programme-level learning outcomes. Module learning outcomes must be designed in such a way as to ensure programme learning outcomes are met.
8. There should be no option choice in year 1 - except to allow students to take a Language for All or similar module as an in-programme offer.
9. The degree of option choice in year 2 should be limited and depend largely on student numbers. The exact number of modules will depend on a number of factors, including the degree to which a programme shares modules with similar programmes in contiguous subject areas often in the same department. Smaller programmes with cohort sizes below 30 students must consider how the sharing of modules across programmes from a limited pool can create sustainability. For programmes with larger cohorts, the expectation is that contiguous subjects should share modules wherever possible to manage the total number of modules in an area of study (e.g. education or bio-sciences). Consideration should be given to designing year 2 modules that can be taught by a colleagues across the programme team and not dependent on any one member of the team.
10. If student numbers allow, option choice can be greater in year 3 to reflect the distinctiveness of subject areas and research-informed teaching. The expectation remains that contiguous subjects share modules wherever possible to manage the total number of modules in an area of study.
11. The minimum standard face-to-face contact time for a 20 credit module is 36 hours.
12. Module delivery should follow one of two general patterns depending on student numbers:
	* Pattern A: between 20 and 50 students, modules (20 credits, term long) should be taught as a single group by a tutor (or the equivalent FTE if there are a number of specialist sub-areas). Modules of this size should be taught as a single timetabled block if there is a mix of whole group and smaller group or workshop activities; or, where student registrations permit, split into discrete sessions, e.g. 1 hour whole group and two 2 hour smaller group sessions;
	* Pattern B: above 50 students, modules should be taught as a single whole group lecture or equivalent supported by smaller classes of approximately 20-25 students typically on a 1 + 2 hour model. For timetabling purposes, the large and smaller group sessions will be booked as separate items.
	* Laboratory, studio and practical work may also be constrained by the size and capacity of teaching space and this may impact on the exact delivery and timetabling of modules.
13. This university-wide framework must be used in the review and revalidation of all programmes; and should reflect the requirements for teaching the subject, research specialisms and market demand. In applying the framework, programmes should consider the budget position and staff student ratios in the department and programme area. Programme delivery plans will be reviewed and approved by Curriculum Strategy Committee.
1. <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/quality-code-part-b> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)