|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Articulation into Aston programme** | **Student exchange partnership** | **Off campus**  **Delivery** | **Shared delivery** | **Double award** | **Dual award** | **Joint award** | **Cotutelle** | **Franchise** | **Validation** |
| Description of model | Students who satisfy the academic criteria on a partner’s programme are automatically entitled (on academic grounds) to be admitted with advanced standing to a programme of the University. | Study exchange | Most or all of a programme is delivered by Aston staff at a partner location. The partner may have some responsibility for administrative and other support, and for the provision of learning resources, such as library and IT resources. The programme leads to an Aston Award. | One or more awarding bodies share with Aston the responsibility for development and/or delivery of a programme leading to an Aston Award.    See also Franchise. | Jointly conceived and managed, decisions about student achievement jointly made. Both degree-awarding bodies involved in delivery. Students receive certificate, transcript, and record of achievement from each degree-awarding body, each of which indicates the existence of the other. | Conceived as a joint enterprise. Both degree-awarding bodies are involved in delivery. Designed to enable students to achieve more than one distinct set of criteria. Students may receive separate certificates, unless one programme leads into the other (e.g.they are at different levels) | Where arrangements are joint in all aspects, involving partners in roughly equal proportions in all aspects of design, development, delivery, assessment, management and decision-making on student achievement.  Students must achieve a single, shared set of learning outcomes and gain a single certificate  Confirmation will need to be provided that each partner has the legal capacity to engage in such an award. | A research degree is jointly supervised by supervisors from different universities from different countries. Students are enrolled at both institutions throughout the duration of their research and spend a minimum of six months at each institution. During their enrolment, students are jointly supervised by a member of staff from Aston and a member of staff from the partner institution and have access to the research facilities of both institutions for the duration of their enrolment. May be Dual or Joint award. | The University agrees to authorise another organisation to deliver (and sometimes assess) part or all of one (or more) of its own approved programmes. | The University judges a module or programme developed and delivered by another organisation, and approves it as being of an appropriate standard and quality to contribute, or lead, to one of its awards. |
| Enrolment / Award | Aston | Aston | Aston | Aston | Aston/Partner Two Awards | Aston/Partner Two Awards | Aston/Partner One joint Award | Aston/Partner One Joint or Two Awards | Aston/ Aston Award | Partner / Partner award |
| Risk level | Medium | Low to Medium | Medium | Medium to High | Medium to High | Medium | High | Medium | Medium to High | High |
| What constitutes success? | Significantly increased student numbers on existing programmes | Student learning experience is expanded, prestigious partners enhance Aston’s reputation | Additional income stream, enhanced reputation in region | Additional income stream, enhanced reputation in region | Student learning experience expanded, increased numbers, enhanced reputation in region | Student learning experience expanded, increased student numbers, enhanced reputation in region | New programme offering benefit of both institutions’ experience, good recruitment, sharing of staff expertise, enhanced reputation in region | Student experience expanded and opportunities for research widened. | Additional income stream, enhanced reputation in region | Additional income stream, enhanced reputation in region |
| Risks | Mapping of partner provision not thorough enough/ insufficient support offered to students on transition/ insufficient updating of mapping done as provision develops, leading to poor progression. | Partners usually through ERASMUS+, so few risks. Insufficient support on transition, lack of clarity on translation of marks could have negative effect on progression/relationship with partner | Insufficient due diligence on partner’s facilities or location of study, Aston staff unprepared to travel, support staff not geared up for cohort could negatively impact quality. Poor marketing arrangements in country could negatively impact recruitment | Partner staff not sufficiently qualified or trained in Aston processes could negatively impact quality of provision. | Insufficient due diligence or risk assessment of partner could mean negative reputational impact. Partner staff not sufficiently qualified or trained in Aston processes could negatively impact quality of provision | Insufficient due diligence or risk assessment of partner could mean negative reputational impact. Partner staff not sufficiently qualified or trained in Aston processes could negatively impact quality of provision. Regular Programme Management Committee meetings needed. | Insufficient due diligence or risk assessment of partner could mean negative reputational impact. Partner staff not sufficiently qualified or trained in Aston processes could negatively impact quality of provision. Essential that partner has very robust quality assurance processes in line with Aston’s. Essential that significant joint preparation has taken place. Regular Programme Management Committee meetings needed. | Insufficient due diligence or risk assessment of partner could mean negative reputational impact. Partner staff not sufficiently qualified or trained in Aston processes could negatively impact quality of provision. | Insufficient due diligence on partner’s facilities or location of study could mean negative reputational impact. Partner staff not sufficiently qualified or trained in Aston processes could negatively impact quality of provision. Quality of staff is essential. Oversight of assessment process essential. Regular Programme Management Committee meetings needed. | Rarely approved. Insufficient due diligence or risk assessment of partner could mean negative reputational impact. Little control over validation on a day to day basis. |