**Additional information for Dual Award Approval**

This form should be completed by the School/Department (the proposer) and presented to the approval panel together with the programme specification, module descriptions and staff CVs.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal** |
| School/department(s) |  |
| Partner |  |
| Programme(s) |  |
| Date of first intake |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Arrangements** |
| **Academic oversight and programme management**  *(Will each awarding body oversee its own qualification, e.g. in terms of quality assurance procedures? Is a joint programme board required to make recommendations on the management of the programme?)* |  |
| **Curriculum development/modification**  *(How will this operate? Who will approve modifications to the programme?)* |  |
| **Programme specification**  *(Including curriculum map, for both awards?)* |  |
| **Enrolment**  *(Are students enrolled at both institutions and will the same enrolment criteria apply for both institutions / awards?)* |  |
| **Assessment**  How will assessments be set, marked and moderated. If the same marking scheme is not used at both partners how will this be managed? If marks are not counted towards classification, will articulation agreements be established for advanced entry? |  |
| **External examining**  *(How will this operate, e.g. if partner level 5 incorporated into Roehampton award it will need internal and external moderation?)* |  |
| **Academic regulations**  *(Which academic regulations will apply? Do the partner academic regulations apply to the sections of the programme they ‘own’, does there need to be a variation to the regulations? How will mitigating circumstances and academic misconduct arrangements operate?)* |  |
| **Monitoring and review**  *(Will usual monitoring and review procedures of each partner apply to their component of the programme? Or will a bespoke procedure be devised which meets requirements of both awarding bodies?)* |  |
| **Examination boards** *(How will assessment boards run? Might require a joint board to sign off both awards)* |  |
| **Certification and transcripts**  *(Confirm that separate certificates are issued. Will specific wording be required?)* |  |

The following table describes two possible approaches to aspects of quality assurance of qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body, referenced to the relevant Expectation in the Quality Code, Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards. The two columns are intended to illustrate distinctly contrasting approaches at opposite ends of the spectrum, and between them lie a range of possibilities that may be employed in any specific circumstance. The appropriateness of any particular approach depends in particular on whether the qualifications are co-dependent and mutually contingent, or integrated but independent.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Academic oversight (Expectation A2.1) | The qualification is jointly overseen. This is typically achieved by a joint board or consortium, which is established to be accountable to the highest academic authority in the respective degree-awarding bodies. The respective highest academic authority may delegate decision-making to the joint body on a range of matters, including approval of and changes to the programme, assessment strategies, appointment of examiners (including external examiners) and changes  to regulations.  The governance arrangements  are approved by the degree- awarding bodies, as are a range of policies and procedures specific to the award of the qualification (or an agreement is made to adopt the policies and procedures of one of the partners).  Day-to-day programme management is usually undertaken jointly, with all participating partners represented on a programme team. | Each degree-awarding body oversees its own qualification, using its own policies and procedures.  There may be a consortium or joint programme management board to enable joint decision-making about, and management of, the programme on a range of matters. However, this would make recommendations through the normal academic decision-making structures of each of the respective awarding bodies, rather than having delegated authority to make decisions on their behalf. |
| Academic regulations (Expectation A2.1) | The participating degree-awarding bodies jointly determine which academic regulations govern the award of the qualification(s). Bespoke regulations may be agreed and approved by all the partners, ensuring that the academic standards of each of the degree-awarding bodies involved are satisfied. In some cases, these may be exceeded to take account of a particular partner's requirements but under no circumstances are they compromised. | As individual and separate  qualifications are awarded, the academic regulations of each of the degree-awarding bodies apply to the sections of the programme they deliver. The academic standards of each of the degree-awarding bodies involved have to be satisfied.  In some cases, these may be exceeded to take account of a particular partner's requirements but in no circumstances are  they compromised. |
| Programme approval (Expectation  A3.1) | The programme is jointly approved, through an approval process involving representation from all the degree-awarding bodies involved.  Detailed approval of modules or components is also undertaken jointly. | The programme is approved through each degree-awarding body's usual  channels for programme approval.  UK degree-awarding bodies may accept the detailed approval processes undertaken at module level by their partners for the modules or components that those partners are delivering. UK degree-awarding bodies retain responsibility for making an assessment as to whether the  proposed programme as an entity (and its assessment strategy) delivers and tests programme outcomes at the appropriate level for the award, and maintains its own academic standards as a degree-awarding body. |
| Assessment  (Expectation  A3.2) | Each participating  degree-awarding body is normally responsible for the assessment of the components of the programme that it delivers. A holistic view of the assessment strategy is taken by  the joint authority that oversees the programme. In particular, a  decision is made about whether a  single marking scheme will be adopted or whether components of assessed work will be marked in accordance with the local regimes and then rescaled to a single scheme.  All partners agree a common set of assessment regulations. | Each degree-awarding body is  normally responsible for the assessment of the components of the programme that it delivers. Each degree-awarding body is responsible for the overall assessment strategy leading to its qualification. The programme is subject to that degree-awarding body's assessment regulations for the respective qualifications.  Marks are then imported from the other partner (as appropriate) by each degree-awarding body for the qualification it awards. A decision is made about whether a single marking scheme is to be adopted  by all participants in the jointly delivered programme or whether components of assessment will be marked in accordance with the local regimes and then rescaled to the scheme of each individual degree-awarding body. |
| Examination  board (Expectation A3.2) | A joint, usually bespoke, examination board (or equivalent) is established to oversee progression through the programme and the award of a qualification. | Assessment decisions are taken  by an examination board, which conforms to the requirements of the degree-awarding body involved.  A joint board, additional and subsidiary to those already existing  in each degree-awarding body, may be established to oversee the  confirmation of marks for individual components and determine  progression through the jointly conceived programme. The joint board reports to the relevant  structures in the individual degree-awarding bodies. |
| External  examining (Expectation A3.4) | UK degree-awarding bodies  consider what external examining arrangements are appropriate to satisfy the requirements of all the partners involved. Joint or dual appointments may be feasible. | The UK degree-awarding  body's usual external examining arrangements apply to modules that the degree-awarding body delivers and also with respect to the award of the qualification |
| Monitoring and  review (Expectation A3. 3) | A collective decision is  made about the monitoring and review procedures to be adopted, which satisfies the principles of each of the degree-awarding bodies involved. | The usual monitoring and  review procedures of each of the partners apply to the component of the programme that they respectively deliver, and the outputs are shared with the other partners. Reports are submitted through each degree-awarding body's own quality assurance framework.  A process for periodic review is decided collectively and the outcome reported through each degree-awarding body's own quality assurance framework. |
| Certification and transcripts  (Expectation  A2.2) | On successful completion of the programme, a student  receives either of the following:   a single certificate or equivalent document, which lists the title of the qualification as recognised in all of the legal frameworks in which the participating degree-awarding  bodies are based, to aid qualification recognition   a certificate from each of the degree-awarding bodies involved - the certificate and/or transcript or record of achievement, or Diploma Supplement, of at least the UK degree-awarding body or bodies refer to the existence of the other(s) and makes clear that they refer to the completion of a single, jointly conceived, programme of study and assessed learning leads  to more than one separate qualification.  Where legally permissible,  the same reference is included on the documents issued by the other degree-awarding body or bodies.  Where a single certificate is awarded, each degree-awarding body has in place systems and processes that enable it to jointly produce award certificates without risking their control of their crests, logos, watermarks, holographs and authorising signatures. | Students who successfully achieve each set of criteria  (learning outcomes or other requirements) receive  separate institutional or national certificates, one for each  of the separate qualifications being granted by each of the  degree-awarding bodies involved. |

*(QAA Characteristics Statement Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body)*