

Considerations in designing and running joint honours programmes

Intellectual / professional coherence

1. Is there a market demand for this programme – is there evidence it attracts top calibre students in sufficient number? If there is market demand, what is the appropriate size for the programme? Is there evidence of a professional desire for graduates with this skill set?
2. Does the programme reflect an area of intellectual activity pursued by academics in the University – either that a specific academic(s) is working across the disciplinary boundary or at least that there are demonstrable intellectual links between academics in each of the disciplines.
3. There is an intellectual benefit to the combination of these particular disciplines?

Academic support

4. Single lead personal tutor for all students on the programme who has experience of the programme – all students meet each other and this person within induction week
5. Lead Programme Director – with secondary contacts in the other School involved, but single lead providing leadership for teaching and learning, programme development and academic student support – the person students are told about as responsible for their programme and experience to whom problems are addressed, feedback submitted etc. The secondary contact in the other School plays a full role in the programme management, and is responsible for ensuring academic integration from the perspective of the second School. Students are encouraged to take issues to this second person in relation to the second school – but they are solved through holistic thinking.
6. Careers advice provided tailored to the programme
7. Regular meetings of all cohort on programme as a cohort group to build cohesion at least twice a term
8. Clear Blackboard structure for cohort including dedicated site for programme

Organisation

9. Single lead Administrator (with Liaison Officer in each other school/department) responsible for ensuring learning and assessment works for the students
10. Timetable of teaching and assessment that does not involve clashes or make inappropriate provision – including coursework submission timing.
11. Liaison between Lead Administrator and Liaison Officer to ensure Examination boards, extenuating circumstances committees, and progress reports are coordinated with integrated reporting to Faculty Examination and Progress bodies.
12. Consultation with students about whether to produce a handbook specifically for the programme – and action to implement the outcome of that consultation.
13. Single set of rules for progression, deadlines, extensions, word limits, attendance and (any) penalty schemes for all units within the programme (excluding open units). Where differences cannot be avoided clear provision of integrated information so students get a single clear model of progression and assessment issues.

Quality Assurance

14. Clear statement of academic rationale for programme; programme specification setting out how the constituent parts are integrated and how learning outcomes are distinct from each single honours programme.

15. Student feedback specifically analysed by programme
16. Student participation from the programme in staff student liaison with specified time set aside for feedback from the programme cohort in addition to generic feedback
17. EAP stage one and two reviews conducted for the programme in its own right where practicable followed by implementation of recommendations
19. High level of student satisfaction on programme
20. Results profile at least as good as single honours candidates.
21. Career destination data at least as good as single honours candidates.

Admissions

22. Clear marketing strategy
23. Review of admissions offer grades
24. Testing to ensure at least neutral compared to the single honours programmes in relation to Widening Participation milestones