

# QH Supplement CP4: Guidance for designing a dual taught degree

## 1. Course design

---

1.1 Dual degrees are designed to lock together with overlapping curricula. The period of study and volume of learning (credits) is greater than for either of the individual awards but less than if the courses of study had been undertaken consecutively.

### Further information

- Requirements for dual award doctoral collaborations can be found in QHS CP5.

1.2 Where existing courses are being offered on a dual degree basis, mapping is undertaken to ensure that credits undertaken at each partner allow the students to meet the learning outcomes of each award. This may result in amendments to the NTU course, which are considered as part of the academic approval event.

1.3 Dual degrees may be new courses which are designed to articulate. In such cases, approval of the course(s) will form part of the academic approval process.

1.4 The partners need to determine mechanisms for ensuring the two courses continue to articulate; this includes when changes are proposed to either course.

## 2. Approval

---

2.1 No course approval is required where the dual degree uses an existing course, however the mapping between the two degrees must be approved by the Partnership Development and Approval Group responsible for approving the collaborative arrangements. Please see [QHS 10B](#) for more information.

## 3. Approval criteria

---

3.1 The table below indicates which of the University's approval criteria apply to dual taught degrees.

3.2 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
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"> <li>• Corporate material (Desk-based due diligence.);</li> <li>• Discussions with partner leadership team;</li> <li>• References from current partners</li> </ul>
b. <i>[Where the partner is a degree awarding body]</i> . Educational standing and professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB) requirements: any applicable national or local governmental requirements and PSRBs are being met.	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"> <li>• Collaborative Operational Document (COD);</li> <li>• Organisational structure and accompanying narrative;</li> <li>• Discussions with leadership and operational teams.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Staff CVs;</li> <li>• Discussion with course team(s);</li> <li>• References from current partners</li> </ul>
i. Reasonable expectations for the provision of staff development on an annual basis have been defined (B2).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COD;</li> <li>• Staff CVs;</li> <li>• Discussions with leadership and operational teams.</li> </ul>
j. Appropriate resources and support have been identified by the School and the partner and responsibilities for the provision of these have been defined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COD;</li> <li>• Feedback from external panel member (where required)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions with representatives from the partner and School.</li> </ul>
k. There is appropriate student support in place, both academic and pastoral, including English language support where applicable (B2).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COD;</li> <li>Discussions with leadership and operational teams.</li> </ul>
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).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COD;</li> <li>Discussions with leadership and operational teams.</li> </ul>
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).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COD;</li> </ul>
p. Effective arrangements are in place for monitoring and reporting (B1, B2, B3, B4, B5).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COD;</li> <li>Organisational structure and accompanying documents</li> </ul>
q. The proposed governance arrangements are effective for maintaining oversight of the provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COD;</li> <li>Organograms;</li> <li>Meeting Terms of Reference (ToR).</li> </ul>
r. A Collaborative Academic Lead (CAL) 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"> <li>CAL role specification;</li> <li>Discussions with leadership and operational teams.</li> </ul>
s. Arrangements for the production and approval of marketing and promotion materials are defined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COD</li> </ul>

## 4. Governance

---

- 4.1 Each degree awarding body is responsible for its own award but the two components form a single package, and the overall arrangement is a joint enterprise that requires elements of joint management and oversight.
- 4.2 A joint course committee or management board may be established to facilitate joint decision making, but the committee or management board has no authority in its own right and can only make recommendations to be taken through the normal decision making structures of each partner.

## 5. Delivery and assessment

---

- 5.1 Each partner delivers a substantial proportion of the course leading to its own award.
- 5.2 Each partner is responsible for the assessment strategy of its own award, and for assessing the parts of the course it delivers.
- 5.3 Marks are shared between institutions and, depending on the arrangement, a single marking scheme may be adopted or components of assessment can be marked in accordance with local regimes and then rescaled to the scheme of each individual degree awarding body.
- 5.4 The University's standard common assessment regulations, as set out in [Quality Handbook Section 16](#), apply to its own award. The academic regulations of the partner institution apply to the elements of the course that they deliver.
- 5.5 The University's normal external examining arrangements apply to its own award. The NTU external examiner must review the assessment undertaken by students from both institutions that contributes to the NTU award.
- 5.6 Separate Boards of Examiners are held by each institution for its own award. Members of the partner institution may attend the University's board and vice versa. A joint, additional and subsidiary board may be established to determine progression through the joint programme.

## 6. Quality Assurance

---

- 6.1 Each partner's own mechanisms for annual monitoring and reporting will apply, and outcomes are shared between institutions.

## 7. Review criteria

7.1 The table below indicates which of the University’s approval criteria apply to dual taught degrees

Review Criteria	Evidence for review
<b>The strategy and context for the collaboration</b>	
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"> <li>• Discussion with the CAL;</li> <li>• Desk-based due diligence;</li> <li>• Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global);</li> <li>• Due diligence documents prepared as part of business evaluation</li> </ul>
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 PSRBs continue to be met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement from the partner supported by copies of relevant reports/links to relevant reports. <i>(May require translation.)</i></li> </ul>
e. Executive, administrative and academic responsibilities for the delivery of the courses are assigned to individuals and groups and are clearly defined and understood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School/partner/CADQ reflection on the operation of the collaboration;</li> <li>• Course/thematic deep dive;</li> <li>• Organisational chart;</li> <li>• Discussions with leadership and operational teams;</li> <li>• Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global);</li> <li>• Due diligence documents prepared as part of business evaluation</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Minutes or action logs from relevant forums;</li> <li>• Periodic Review (PR) report(s).</li> </ul>
<b>Review of the operation of the collaboration</b>	

<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"> <li>• Staff list for each course, and CVs;</li> <li>• Review of changes to the staff team;</li> <li>• Student feedback;</li> <li>• Student outcomes data;</li> <li>• Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)</li> </ul>
<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"> <li>• Student feedback;</li> <li>• Discussions with the course team;</li> <li>• CAL/EE reports;</li> <li>• Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)</li> </ul>
<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"> <li>• Student feedback;</li> <li>• CAL/EE reports;</li> <li>• Discussions with the course team;</li> <li>• Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)</li> </ul>
<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 high quality academic experience and that students succeed in and beyond higher education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• Student surveys;</li> <li>• Discussion with students;</li> <li>• Discussion with course teams</li> </ul>
<p>l. Student achievement and graduate outcomes data have been analysed and the results used to inform course development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to ground', to be determined by the partner (and School).</li> </ul>
<p>o. Monitoring and reporting arrangements have been effectively applied.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to ground', to be determined by the partner (and School).</li> </ul>
<p>p. Governance arrangements are effective in maintaining oversight of the provision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how the arrangements specified in the COD 'run to</li> </ul>

	ground', to be determined by the partner (and School).
q. The role of the CAL 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"> <li>• Discussion with the CAL;</li> <li>• Feedback from the partner;</li> <li>• Periodic Review commentary on the management of collaborative provision;</li> <li>• Reports from visits and any ongoing regular meetings (available from NTU Global)</li> </ul>
r. Arrangements for the production and approval of marketing and promotion materials are effective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of how arrangements in the COD are applied;</li> <li>• Discussion with course team(s) and/or members of the administration teams.</li> </ul>

<b>Policy owner</b>
CADQ

<b>Change history</b>			
<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	None
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 SB10 to SB7.
Sept 2022	22.09.22	01.10.22	None
Sept 2023	14.09.23	01.10.23	None
Jan 2024	25.01.24	30.01.24	Renumbered CP5.
Sept 2024	19.09.24	01.10.24	None
Sept 2025	25.09.25	01.10.25	Renamed CP4 (from CP5).

<b>Equality Impact Analysis</b>		
<i>Version:</i>	<i>EIA date:</i>	<i>Completed by:</i>
Sept 2016		