

QH Supplement CP3: Guidance for designing joint or double taught degrees

1. Legal requirements

- 1.1 It is the responsibility of the University to ensure that there are no legal or regulatory requirements in the country in which they are operating which may impede the award of a joint or double degree to students.

Further information

- Requirements for joint, double and dual doctoral award collaborations can be found in [QHS CP5](#).

2. Course design

- 2.1 The defining feature of a joint or double degree is that it is a distinctive educational programme that none of the partners could offer, in that form, independently of others.
- 2.2 A joint or double degree course is jointly designed by both partners and is a joint enterprise from the earliest stages.
- 2.3 All partners in a joint or double degree arrangement must provide substantial contributions to the creation, management and decision making.
- 2.4 Joint and double degrees usually include mobility between the two institutions, and each partner delivers a substantial proportion of the course. Typically, NTU would expect to deliver 50% or more of the course.
- 2.5 For joint degrees, decisions will need to be made about which institution issues the certificate and transcript.

3. Approval

- 3.1 A joint approval event is held where possible. The approval event includes representation from all the degree awarding bodies involved.

4. Approval criteria

- 4.1 The table below indicates which of the University’s approval criteria apply to joint/double taught degrees.
- 4.2 The evidence for approval/review is for guidance only and is not designed to be a prescriptive list. It is for the School and the partner to determine how they evidence that the criteria are met, and for the approval group to use their professional judgement to decide whether the information provided is sufficient evidence that the criteria is met.

Approval Criteria	Evidence for approval
The strategy and context for the collaboration	
a. The partner’s educational/organisational ethos and aims are compatible with those of the University and the ambitions within ‘University, Reimagined’.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate material (Desk-based due diligence.) • Discussions with partner leadership team • References from current partners
b. <i>[Where the partner is a degree awarding body]</i> Educational standing and PSRB requirements: any applicable national or local governmental requirements and standards and/or the requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs) are being met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement from the partner supported by copies of relevant reports/links to relevant reports. (May require translation.)
f. There is an appropriate forum and, where relevant, appropriate processes in place to support the quality management and enhancement of the course or courses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document • Organisational structure and accompanying narrative. • Discussions with leadership and operational teams.
Approval of the operation of the collaboration	
g. The partner has appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver and manage the course or courses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff CVs; • Discussion with course team(s); • References from current partners

<p>i. Reasonable expectations for the provision of staff development on an annual basis have been defined (B2).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document. • Staff CVs • Discussions with leadership and operational teams.
<p>j. Appropriate resources and support have been identified by the School and the partner and responsibilities for the provision of these have been defined.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document • Feedback from external panel member (where required) • Discussions with representatives from the partner and School.
<p>k. There is appropriate student support in place, both academic and pastoral, including English language support where applicable (B2).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document • Discussions with leadership and operational teams.
<p>l. Methods have been identified by the partner and the School for effective engagement with students and responsibilities for engagement have been clearly defined (B2).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document. • Discussions with leadership and operational teams.
<p>m. The responsibility for the analysis of student achievement and graduate outcomes and mechanisms for using the data to inform course development are clearly defined and appropriate (B3).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document
<p>n. Where relevant, academic regulations are at least as rigorous as those of the University, are designed to ensure that relevant awards are credible and are designed to ensure effective assessment of technical proficiency in the English language in a manner that appropriately reflects the level and content of the course (B4).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic regulations

o. Responsibilities for the management of appeals and complaints have been agreed and are appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic regulations • Collaborative operational document
p. Effective arrangements are in place for monitoring and reporting (B1, B2, B3, B4, B5).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document • Organisational structure and accompanying
q. The proposed governance arrangements are effective for maintaining oversight of the provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document • Organograms; • Meeting ToR.
r. A collaborative academic lead is in place, their role has been scoped and defined and it is clear how they will be supported to undertake their role, including through appropriate time allocation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Academic Lead role specification. • Discussions with leadership and operational teams.
s. Arrangements for the production and approval of marketing and promotion materials are defined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative Operational Document

5. Governance

5.1 The two institutions will need to establish mechanisms for maintaining joint oversight of the joint degree course, including any joint governance committees or boards. For double degrees, each partner oversees its own qualification.

6. Delivery and assessment

6.1 Each partner is normally responsible for the assessment of the parts of the course that it delivers. Mechanisms may be put in place for joint moderation of assessment across institutions.

6.2 The course teams need to establish whether a joint marking scheme will be used, or whether assessed work will be marked in accordance with each institution's marking scheme, and then re-scaled to a single scheme for the purposes of making the award.

- 6.3 All partners agree a common set of assessment regulations. Bespoke regulations may be designed and approved as part of the academic approval process, ensuring that the academic standards of each of the degree-awarding bodies are satisfied.
- 6.4 Academic appeals, irregularities, extenuating circumstances and complaints are either managed jointly by both partners using a set of pre-agreed processes, or are managed separately by the institution at which the student is studying at the time.
- 6.5 The course is jointly managed on a day to day basis by both partners in accordance with the approved Collaborative Operational Document.

7. Quality assurance

- 7.1 The University is ultimately responsible for the standards and quality of the qualifications it awards, irrespective of who delivers it or where it is delivered.
- 7.2 Quality assurance arrangements made between the degree awarding bodies must protect those degree awarding bodies' academic standards. The standards and requirements for assuring quality and standards may exceed those usually required but may not be less.
- 7.3 The partners determine jointly the mechanisms for annual monitoring and reporting of the course.
- 7.4 External examining arrangements need to be agreed to satisfy UK requirements and the requirements of other partners involved. Where possible the University's normal external examining arrangements should apply. It may be feasible for joint or dual appointments to be made.
- 7.5 A joint Board of Examiners is held to determine progression and achievement of the students. For double degrees, separate boards may be held but should include representation from both partners at each.
- 7.6 Students who complete a joint or double degree are eligible to take part in the Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS). Course teams should consider how to promote this to students to encourage participation.

8. Review criteria

- 8.1 The table below indicates which of the University's approval criteria apply to joint/double taught degrees.

Review Criteria	Evidence for review
The strategy and context for the collaboration	
a. The partner's educational/organisational ethos and aims continue to be compatible with those of the University and the ambitions within 'University, Reimagined'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion with the CAL. Desk-based due diligence. reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global) due diligence documents prepared as part of business evaluation

<p>b. [Where the partner is a degree awarding body] Educational standing and PSRB requirements: any applicable national or local governmental requirements and standards and/or the requirements of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs) continue to be met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement from the partner supported by copies of relevant reports/links to relevant reports. (<i>May require translation.</i>)
<p>f. There is an appropriate forum and, where relevant, appropriate processes in place to support the quality management and enhancement of the course or courses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes or action logs from relevant forums. PR report(s).
<p>Review of the operation of the collaboration</p>	
<p>g. The partner continues to have appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver and manage the course or courses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff list for each course, and CVs. Review of changes to the staff team Student feedback Student outcomes data reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)
<p>i. Appropriate resources and support have been provided by the School and/or the partner and both parties have met their responsibilities for the provision of resources set out in the COD.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student feedback Discussions with the course team CAL/EE reports reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)
<p>j. Students are well supported academically and pastorally, including with English language where applicable and responsibilities for student support set out in the COD have been met.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student feedback CAL/EE reports Discussions with the course team. Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)
<p>k. Students are engaged effectively in their learning and in the quality management and enhancement of their course(s). Student engagement helps to ensure a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to ground'. This may include student survey results, evidence of how student feedback has been discussed and responded to. Student survey

high quality academic experience and that students succeed in and beyond higher education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion with students • Discussion with the course teams
l. Student achievement and graduate outcomes data have been analysed and the results used to inform course development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to ground', to be determined by the partner (and School).
m. Where a centre is applying its own regulations to an NTU course: academic regulations continue to be appropriate in the context of any regulatory changes and have been applied consistently to ensure that relevant awards are credible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how regulations have been applied, for example, academic misconduct data, marking criteria. • Evidence of how regulations have been kept up to date.
n. Where appeals and complaints are managed by the partner: appeals and complaints have been managed as agreed in the COD and in line with any relevant regulations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how regulations have been applied, for example, academic misconduct data, marking criteria. • Evidence of how regulations have been kept up to date
o. Monitoring and reporting arrangements have been effectively applied.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to ground', to be determined by the partner (and School).
p. Governance arrangements are effective in maintaining oversight of the provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to ground', to be determined by the partner (and School).
q. The role of the collaborative academic lead is working effectively and in line with the COD. The CAL has been supported by their School to undertake their role, including through appropriate time allocation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion with the CAL • feedback from the partner • Periodic review commentary on the management of collaborative provision • Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)
r. Arrangements for the production and approval of marketing and promotion materials are effective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of how arrangements in the COD are applied. • Discussion with course team(s) and/or members of the administration teams.

Policy owner
CADQ

Change history			
<i>Version:</i>	<i>Approval date:</i>	<i>Implementation date:</i>	<i>Nature of significant revisions:</i>
Sept 2016	30.09.16	01.10.16	New supplement
Sept 2017	12.09.17	01.10.17	No major changes
Sept 2018	12.09.18	01.10.18	None
Sept 2019	11.09.19	01.10.19	None
Sept 2020	16.09.20	01.10.20	Update to Supplement title to clarify this guidance applies to taught degrees only (cross-reference to research degree guidance also added)
Sept 2021	07.09.21	01.10.21	Change of Supplement number from SB9 to SB6.
Sept 2022	22.09.22	01.10.22	None
Sept 2023	14.09.23	01.10.23	None
Jan 2024	25.01.24	30.1.24	Renumbered CP4.
Sept 2024	19.09.24	01.10.24	None
Sept 2025	25.09.25	01.10.25	Approval and review criteria have been incorporated from QHS CP1. Reference added to eligibility for GOS. Renumbered from CP4 to CP3.