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Approval, Management and Review of Dual Awards

# Introduction

* 1. A dual award is a qualification given as two awards, each from a different organisation with degree awarding powers, for the same programme of study. The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) describes them as being jointly delivered and this, together with the fact that both partners are making an award, helps distinguish them from other forms of collaboration, particularly from validated programmes or joint awards. The implications of this are spelt out in the QAA Characteristics Statement for qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body, 2020. The University of Hull sees dual awards as bringing benefits to both partners as well as to their students from combining their skills and knowledge. A dual award may be based on an existing programme in the partner and/or at Hull but **should** be characterised by design, development and delivery which has substantial involvement from each partner resulting in a jointly delivered programme which could not be provided by either partner separately. In some cases, the students may study in both locations, although this is not a requirement.
	2. To secure substantial joint contributions from each partner, both **must** be involved in the development, delivery and management of the programme. This includes the development of teaching materials, assessments and the on-going review of the programme as well as delivery.
	3. This **must** include:
		1. a minimum input of 25% to the delivery of the programme. This may be achieved by:
			1. each partner being solely responsible for at least one quarter of the modules
			2. each partner having an input into a larger proportion of modules but in such a way that overall, at least a quarter of the delivery of all the modules rests with each partner
			3. ensuring that the balance of input is such that all students will engage with each partner for at least a quarter of their study activity. This means that care **should** be taken to ensure that any core/compulsory/optional split cannot result in a student engaging with one partner for less than a quarter of the programme.
		2. and the involvement of both partners in:
			1. assessment, including:
* participation in Assessment Boards
* setting and first marking assessments relating to module(s) for which the partner concerned is the primary deliverer
* having engagement (usually in the form of moderation) in the assessment of modules delivered by other partner(s).
	+ - 1. programme review and development including:
* initial programme design
* the development of teaching materials and of assessments
* annual review and minor modifications
* where applicable, periodic programme review.
	1. Note that:
		1. it is not necessary for there to be the same division of responsibility across all years of study provided that each partner is involved in the overall programme management
		2. despite that, each partner **should** have involvement in delivery and assessment at the level of the award
		3. where recognition of prior learning is to be accepted for entry, care **should** be taken to ensure that such students will have contact time with each partner for at least a quarter of their dual award programme delivery
		4. the validation panel in the first instance, and subsequently the committees empowered to make modifications, **should** ensure that the estimate of engagement of each partner is agreed and remains appropriate.
	2. Each participating institution **must** have degree-awarding powers in its own country and the award **must** meet all of the Office for Students (OfS) conditions of registration and align to the Quality Code for Higher Education descriptors and benchmarks. Any such award **must** also be robustly quality assured by the UK awarding body in the same way as any other award made in its name.

# Approval of a Dual Award

* 1. Initial approval to progress a dual award **must** come from Senate on the recommendation of the Pro Vice Chancellor (Education). The faculty **must** complete and submit a proposal form signed by the relevant head(s) of academic unit and faculty dean(s). The Pro Vice Chancellor will consider the proposal and make recommendations to Senate, the recommendation **should** be:
		1. reject the request
		2. refer the request to a review panel
		3. approve the request.
	2. Dual awards represent a significant risk for the University and **should** therefore only be approved:
		1. in a subject area in which the University has appropriate subject expertise to carry out joint delivery, moderation of assessment and the other responsibilities required.
		2. either to an existing partner:
			1. with whom the University has already worked successfully for at least four years in a joint franchise or validation model of collaboration
			2. in a subject area in which the University has already worked successfully with the partner for at least three years in a joint franchise or validation model of collaboration
			3. at an academic level at which the University has already worked successfully with the partner for at least three years in a joint franchise or validation model of collaboration.
		3. or to a new partner:
			1. which has had, and used, degree-awarding powers (DAPs) for at least three years
			2. which has had in-country approval throughout that time, subject if applicable to addressing recommendations effectively
			3. which has graduated students successfully, completing their programmes in a timely way and progressing to appropriate employment
			4. which has experience of successful collaborative provision.
	3. This is in addition to the normal requirements for the approval of a new partner as outlined in the relevant process documentation.
	4. A multiple award drawing on three partners may exceptionally be permitted on the basis described above. In such a case:
		1. each partner would give its own award
		2. a student might not study with all the partners
		3. a student would receive awards only from those with which he/she had had contact time for at least one quarter of the programme
		4. each partner is involved in the development and management of the programme.
	5. After approval to progress a dual award has been granted, the usual University approval of new partners’ process **should** be undertaken as per the University Code of Practice: Approval of New Educational Partnerships. The process **should** commence at stage two (strategic case) of the code. In addition, the proposed programme(s) will be validated following the University approval of programmes process.

# Documentation for Programme Approval

## Programme Specification

* 1. The approval of a specific dual award requires the University of Hull to be satisfied that the programme meets the usual UK standards. The partner and the faculty are jointly responsible for producing the programme specification, using the University of Hull template and incorporating OfS and QAA points of reference.

## Module outlines

* 1. Modules to be delivered by the partner may be designed to the partner’s specification but **must** record credit volume (or learning hours as a proxy), academic level, learning outcomes/competencies, content, modes of teaching, learning and assessment, and a reading list. If this is not in place the University of Hull module outline **must** be used. Modules to be delivered by University of Hull staff will be designed on the Hull template.

## Programme management

* 1. Proposals **must** be brought forward for:
		1. Annual monitoring and review of programmes
		2. Programme board of studies
		3. Programme board of examiners
		4. Student-Staff Forum at programme level
		5. A clear indication of programme-specific regulations and code of practice/procedures (or a statement of which institution’s regulations/codes will be used, if applicable)
		6. A designated programme director at Hull and the roles of any other participating staff; The management of transcripts
		7. The management of admissions
		8. Relevant staff CV’s (of the partner institution) including research / scholarship and capacity to maintain the currency of the curriculum.

## Alignment of standards

* 1. During, or prior to, the programme validation panel the faculty and the partner **must** undertake cross-marking of a sample of scripts/assignments from each partner in the subject area(s) in question. This **must** include external examiner input from the UK. The outcomes of this **must** be presented to and discussed with the approval panel.

## Approval panels

* 1. Approval panels will need to be satisfied:
		1. that the dual award is a genuinely joint venture which draws creatively on the experience and expertise of both partners to the benefit of students
		2. as to the partner’s experience and/or understanding of UK expectations and University of Hull processes
		3. that the programme will meet UK points of reference
		4. that any proposed programme-specific regulations will not jeopardise academic standards
		5. a common grading criteria, applicable to all modules, has been agreed by the institution
		6. that the proposed programme management structures appear sound and will articulate appropriately with processes at both partner institutions.
	2. Programme-specific regulations and the wording of certificates and transcripts will require Education Student Experience Committee approval.
	3. The programme(s) **must** normally be taught and assessed in English, however where it is felt that individual modules needed to be taught in a language other than English, this **must** be approved at the Programme Approval stage (along with suitable External Examining and assessment moderation arrangements).

# Programme Management

* 1. For the management of a dual award:
		1. proposals for structures and processes may draw on either partner’s processes or reflect an amalgam of the two
		2. it is not required that a dual award **should** use the same structures as those in place at Hull, but it is required that they provide for the same management activities as the University Programme Boards of Studies, Programme/Module Boards of Examiners and Student-Staff Forums
		3. consideration **should** be given to how annual monitoring and the review of programmes will be best satisfied: by using the partner’s annual review documentation as it stands; by using the University’s annual review documentation; by using either set of documentation with agreed addenda; or by developing a hybrid process
		4. annual programme review **must** report to the Quality Support Service, as well as through the partner’s regular processes
		5. comment on the dual award will be included in the annual Faculty Level Continual Monitoring Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) Journal Report submitted to the Education Student Experience Committee
		6. the programme board of studies **must** include membership from both partners and **must** meet in person, ideally, at least twice per year; other meetings may have representation by videoconference. The balance of membership of the group will depend on the joint delivery envisaged
		7. minor changes to the programme **must** align with the Hull criteria for minor modifications (or where required be brought back for re-validation if major changes are required)
		8. the programme boards of examiners **must** include membership from both partners and **must** meet in person at least once per year; other meetings may have representation by videoconference. The balance of membership of the group will depend on the joint delivery envisaged
		9. a Student-Staff forum **must** be held at programme level with a member of academic staff from the University in attendance at least twice per year; at additional meetings the University may be represented remotely. The balance of membership of the group will depend on the joint delivery envisaged
		10. the outcomes of student feedback questionnaires administered by the partner **must** be made available to the University
		11. provision **must** be made to enter the student data into SITS so that we can calculate degree classifications (if applicable) and issue transcripts (unless this is delegated to the partner) and certificates
		12. student complaints will be handled in the first instance by the awarding body responsible for that aspect of the provision according to their own process. As students will be entitled to refer their complaints to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), the next stage of the complaints process will be handled through the University of Hull with appropriate representation from the partner, which will be agreed as part of the dual award arrangement. Any variations to the University of Hull process **must** be approved by the Education Student Experience Committee
		13. the detail of the management of student appeals will be agreed as part of the dual award arrangement. As students will be entitled to refer their complaint to the OIA the process will follow that of the University of Hull although the appeal panel **must** include representation from both awarding institutions. Any variations to the Hull process **must** be approved by the Education Student Experience Committee
		14. the management of admissions **must** safeguard entry standards and ensure equity of treatment to applicants including those of diverse backgrounds or with disabilities
		15. staff CV’s: the usual process will apply for the approval by the University of staff who the partner wishes to teach on the programme. Approval **must** be obtained before staff start to teach
		16. publicity: the usual process for approval of publicity by the University will apply to publicity relating to the dual award. Publicity issued by either partner **must** make clear that this is a dual award and explain what that means. It will be expected that its distinctiveness will be a feature of the marketing materials. This will include hard copy and electronic media.
	2. Note that the management of a dual award applies to all levels and stages of a programme so that all the credits required for an award are quality assured. Where there is a progression or articulation route this **must** also be quality assured using the University’s procedures for articulation and related processes.

## Regulations and Certificates

* 1. The regulations used may be those of the University of Hull or of the partner or may be specially developed as a ‘hybrid’. In any event the standards of both partners **must** be met and if necessary, those of one partner **must** be exceeded to allow those of the other partner to be met. Where programme or partner specific regulations are required, these **must** be approved by the University Education Student Experience Committee.
	2. If the Hull assessment criteria and marking scales are not to be used, a schedule **must** be drawn up that converts programme marks into standard University of Hull stage weightings. Advice on conversion schedules can be sought from the Academic Services.
	3. The wording of the University of Hull transcript and certificate given to a student **must** make it clear that this is a dual award and **must** reference the location(s) of study. Academic Services will be responsible for proposing wording for certificates and transcripts in consultation with the faculty and the partner. The transcript and certificate provided by the partner **must** do the same unless there is clear evidence that in-country regulations would make this impossible.

## Assessment

* 1. Relevant University of Hull staff **must** be involved in approving examinations, assignments and projects, including liaison with the external examiner. Moderation of scripts by University staff and sampling by the external examiner **must** be undertaken as per University codes of practice.
	2. One or more external examiner(s) **must** be appointed by the University of Hull to its usual role profile, reporting to the University. The terms of engagement are as for on-campus external examiners, including attendance at the Board of Examiners wherever they may be held.
	3. External examiner reports will be sent to the University. The programme director will be responsible, through the usual University processes, for responding to the external examiner in consultation with the partner and for ensuring that the report and response are made known to the Programme Board of Studies and to the students.
	4. Any issues which cannot be resolved with the partner in response to the external examiner will be taken as a matter of urgency to the Faculty Associate Dean (Education).

# Collaborative Provision Agreement

* 1. When a dual award is approved, either an existing agreement will be updated to cover the dual award, or a new/separate memorandum of agreement will be issued. The Global Engagement Office and Quality Support Service will work together to finalise the agreements. The Global Engagement Office will issue the Agreement and inform the faculty concerned when it has been signed so that recruitment can start or continue.

# Version control

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Author** | **Date approved** | **Relevant sections** |
|  | Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Housekeeping, Aug 2024 | * Migrated to new template
* Makes clear the participating institution must have degree-awarding powers in its own country and the award must meet all of the Office for Students (OfS) conditions of registration (para 1.5).
* Revisions to university committees
 |
| V1 02 | Quality Manager  | NA | Migrated to new template |