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1. Introduction

1.1 General principles

Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body (DAB) entail two or more DABs working together as equals to combine their degree-awarding powers. Each organisation has responsibility for the academic standards of the award made in their name.

The University of Dundee (the University) will only consider entering into arrangements for joint, double/multiple or dual qualifications on rare occasions and only where it is in the strategic interests of the University. The University will normally only enter into a joint, double/multiple or dual award arrangement with an institution of at least a similar reputational standing. The purpose of this Code of Practice (CoP) is to provide a framework for staff to consider and develop collaborative qualifications.

A programme of study leading to a joint, double/multiple or dual award is, by default, a distinct programme and will be dealt with as such through the policies and processes laid down by the University’s Quality Framework, and the requirements of External Relations (Student Recruitment and Admissions) and the Registry.

Given the particular considerations that need to be given to the development, delivery and review of joint, double/multiple or dual awards, approval and review of such qualifications will be subject to the specific processes described in Sections 3-5.

This CoP is aligned with the expectation and indicators of sound practice described in Chapter B10 of the QAA UK Quality Code and guidance provided in the QAA Characteristics Statement: Qualifications involving more than one degree-awarding body.

Chapter B10 of the QAA UK Quality Code sets out the following expectation:

‘Degree-awarding bodies take ultimate responsibility for academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities, irrespective of where these are delivered or who provides them. Arrangements for delivering learning opportunities with organisations other than the degree-awarding body are implemented securely and managed effectively.’

1.2 Definitions

A **Joint Qualification** reflects an arrangement where two or more DABs jointly develop and deliver a single programme leading to a single qualification awarded jointly by all of the participating DABs. The DABs pool their degree-awarding powers to award one qualification together. Students graduate with a single degree certificate that attests to the successful completion of the joint programme.

A **Double/Multiple Qualification** normally reflects an arrangement where two or more DABs jointly develop and deliver a single programme leading to separate qualifications and certificates awarded by all of the participating DABs. Each certificate and transcript indicates that a single, jointly-delivered programme of study is leading to more than one qualification. Double/multiple awards are normally developed as an alternative to joint awards where there are legal or regulatory impediments to awarding a joint qualification.

A **Dual Qualification** reflects an arrangement where two DABs offer a **jointly conceived** programme that is integrated but results in two independent qualifications. Dual qualifications may be designed with an interlocking component where curricula overlap, so that students receive two qualifications for a shorter period of study than if each qualification had been undertaken consecutively. Each DAB is responsible for its own award but the two components form a single package, and the overall

1 The definitions have been adapted from the guidance provided in the QAA’s Characteristics Statement on qualifications involving more than one degree awarding body.
arrangement is a joint enterprise that requires elements of joint management and oversight. There may be certain aspects in common between a dual award and an articulation agreement (see below), but they are distinguished by the fact that a dual award reflects a jointly conceived programme of study and where the award made by each DAB is dependent on the other. Under a dual qualification arrangement, where a student completes only one programme of study and satisfies the requirements of only one degree awarding body, a student may receive a single award.

An Articulation Arrangement is a particular form of formal credit-rating and transfer agreement between two institutions, one of which agrees to recognise and grant specific credit and advanced standing to applicants from a named programme of study pursued in the other institution. In these arrangements the two learning experiences are paired together but are not conceived as a joint enterprise, and each organisation retains responsibility for its respective component, although each DAB will have appropriate oversight of the programme of the other organisation. The University has a separate policy that covers articulation arrangements.

2. Regulatory and operational considerations for joint, double/multiple or dual awards

2.1 Key principles

The University will normally only consider joint, double/multiple or dual qualification arrangements where all components of the programme are taught and assessed in the English language. Any deviation from this principle will only be considered under exceptional circumstances, and must have the written agreement of the Director of Academic and Corporate Governance, along with a detailed description of how the University will be assured of the quality and academic standards of any component not taught and assessed in English. These statements will form part of the centrally-held programme documentation.

The University is responsible for the academic standards and the quality of the learning opportunities for all qualifications awarded in its name. This responsibility cannot be shared between the collaborating institutions, and must remain with each awarding institution.

For joint or double/multiple awards, the volume of credit delivered and assessed by the University should reflect the principle of DABs working together as equals and should be broadly proportional to the number of partners. Where the University is jointly delivering a programme with a single partner a minimum of one third of the required credits should normally be delivered and assessed by each institution. For honours degree programmes, the final year of study must be assessed by the University of Dundee to ensure that degree classifications are appropriately aligned with the University’s Assessment Policy for Taught Provision. For postgraduate programmes the dissertation component (or equivalent) that contributes to the final award of ‘Master’ must always be assessed by the University of Dundee.

The minimum number of credits for a qualification awarded by the University as part of a joint, double/multiple or dual award arrangement must be aligned with the Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions in Scotland. Some jointly delivered programmes may require a higher number of credits than these normal expectations and this must be reflected in the relevant degree regulations and information provided to students.

For joint, double/multiple or dual awards, students will normally be registered at each of the DABs for the full duration of the programme.

For joint or double/multiple awards, the arrangements for assessment, including the marking scales and the marking criteria for each component of the programme that counts towards the award, and the mechanism for recording and transferring marks from each institution must be agreed prior to the programme commencing.
For joint awards, students will receive a single certificate bearing the signatures of the relevant authorities of all the DABs involved. The students may graduate at the ceremony of only one of the participating institutions.

For double/multiple or dual awards, students will receive a certificate and transcript from each of the participating institutions. The wording on the certificates and/or transcripts should indicate that the degree is a double/multiple or dual award with another institution(s).

3. Development and approval of joint, double/multiple or dual awards

3.1 Approval to proceed with the proposal

The process requires initial approval of a Stage 1 Proposal (see the Educational Partnerships Development Unit (EPDU) toolkit for teaching collaborations) by the Educational Business Development Oversight Group (EBDOG).

If EBDOG approves the Stage 1 Proposal, which is an agreement in principle to progress the proposal, the next stage involves the development of a Rationale and Business Case and undertaking due diligence and a risk analysis, which should be recorded on the forms provided in the EPDU toolkit for collaborations. This documentation will be considered by EBDOG as Stage 2 of the approval process.

At Stage 2 EBDOG will make a decision on whether the proposal should be progressed to final stage of the approval process which is the formal academic approval of the collaborative programme. The formal academic approval of a proposed jointly delivered programme may only take place once there has been approval by EBDOG to proceed following their review of the Rationale and Business Case, the Due Diligence Checklist and the Risk Review and Action Plan.

The academic approval stage of the process considers the programme specification and supporting information (PSSI) and its constituent modules. The academic approval process also considers the quality of the learning experience provided by the partner organisation(s), the proposed arrangements for managing the collaborative programme and how the programme will be quality assured. The University’s Quality and Academic Standards Committee (QASC, acting on behalf of Senate) makes the final decision on the approval of the collaborative programme.

Note that EBDOG approval at Stages 1 and 2 relates primarily to the business case and risks, and is completely separate from the academic approval stage, where the QASC must be satisfied about the proposed approach to quality and the setting and maintaining of academic standards, and the arrangements for the oversight of the quality of the collaborative programme.

3.2 Academic approval of the jointly delivered programme

3.2.1 Overview

The academic approval stage for a proposed new joint, double/multiple or dual award should be progressed in a similar way to the process described in the University’s Policy and Guidance for the Approval of New Taught Programmes:

https://www.dundee.ac.uk/qf/qualityassurance/newtaughtprovision/

Whilst the general principles for approval of new programmes apply to the approval of joint, double/multiple or dual degree programmes, there are a small number of important differences to the standard process for the approval of new taught programmes. In order to ensure clarity the full process for the academic approval of collaborative programmes is set out below.

3.2.2 Design of a new taught collaborative programme

Programme design should consider the academic and/or professional purpose of the programme, the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) that are necessary to achieve that purpose and how students will
be enabled to achieve these. An integral part of programme design is the strategy to assess how students have achieved the ILOs, including formative assessment elements.

The document Considerations of Good Practice for Taught Programmes defines a set of considerations of good practice for the design, approval and review of taught provision. Where possible, the design of the programme should involve input or feedback from students on related programmes and input from potential employers/industry.

The Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) for the programme should be designed and written to reflect the level of the intended final qualification through the level descriptors provided by the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF) and the Framework for Qualifications of Higher Education Institutions in Scotland. The QAA subject benchmark statements and the requirements of PSRBs should be taken into account where relevant. The ILOs should be described under the following headings:

1. Knowledge and understanding.
2. Subject-specific practical and intellectual skills and attributes.
3. Transferable, employability and enterprise skills and attributes.

Ideally there should be no more than 5 ILOs per heading under these three headline areas.

The programme design must include a detailed mapping of the taught components delivered by the external organisation to the SCQF and relevant QAA subject benchmarks as appropriate. The mapping should include consideration of the SCQF levels and credits.

In the development and description of ILOs, programme developers may find the Bloom’s Taxonomy referenced by the SCQF in their booklet SCQF Credit Rating Criteria Explained to be a helpful resource.

Advice may be sought from the Head of the Academic Skills Centre (ASC) about the development of ILOs and the alignment of approaches to teaching, learning and assessment with the ILOs. The Higher Education Academy also provides useful resources and toolkits to help with the design of taught provision.

3.2.3 Drafting of the programme documentation

A detailed description of the proposed programme should be prepared using the standard University Programme Specification and Supporting Information (PSSI) template. There are separate templates for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The completed template will provide the basis for the definitive programme specification, much of which will be publicly-facing information. Detailed guidance on how to complete the PSSI is provided in separate guidance documents. External Relations require that a separate marketing information form (Update My Course) is also completed. A link to their form is provided in the PSSI templates.

For joint, double/multiple or dual programmes an additional pro forma – ‘Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes’ must also be completed to support the approval process. This pro forma is in place to provide supporting information for each of the stages of the academic approval about the quality of the learning experience provided by the partner organisation(s), the proposed arrangements for managing the collaborative programme and how the programme will be quality assured. There is separate guidance to assist with the completion of the pro forma.

For programmes that have professional accreditation associated with the named degree, a key consideration in the development and approval of a joint, double/multiple or dual awards is whether the collaborative programme meets the requirements of the relevant professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB). It is of critical importance that the status of the degree in respect of PSRB accreditation is represented accurately so that applicants or students are not misled. A definitive
ruling on this must be secured from the relevant PSRB. It is the responsibility of the Dundee programme leader to seek clarity on the status of PSRB accreditation and ensure that public and internal information about the collaborative programme accurately reflects its accreditation status. A commentary on the status of PSRB accreditation must be included in the programme specification documentation.

There may, on occasion, be requirements from other jurisdictions for programmes to be approved, accredited or recognised by a relevant national authorising body. The Dundee programme leader is responsible for ensuring that the relevant approvals have been obtained. As described above, the status of the programme must be clearly publicised and a commentary on the approval, accreditation or recognition by a national authorising body should be included in the programme specification documentation.

3.2.4 Discussions with Professional Services

It is essential that academic staff consult with the following Professional Services during the drafting of the programme documentation (and prior to the internet posting stage):

- External Relations — to discuss the proposed details relating to admissions, recruitment and marketing. Contact: Initial contact should be with the School Marketing Manager.

- The LLC — to discuss the required library resources (e.g. learning support material, teaching input to support the development of digital literacies, proposed use of the VLE and technology enhanced learning). Contacts: The relevant Library Liaison Manager and the Head of the Centre for Technology and Innovation in Learning (CTIL).

- The Registry — to discuss the status of the students, requirements for the exchange and transfer of student data, requirements for graduation, certificates and transcripts, timetabling requirements and, where relevant, requirements for formal examinations. Contacts: see the Directory of Registry Staff (registry@dundee.ac.uk).

- ASC — for support (where necessary) with alignment of the curriculum and its ILOs, teaching methods and assessment tasks, and to discuss requirements for academic skills support and staff development opportunities.

- English for International Students (EIS) — for support (where necessary) with English language skills for students.

- EPDU — for support with completion of the Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes pro forma.

3.2.5 Scrutiny of the draft programme documentation by a Panel of Assessors

Part of the development of all new programmes is the detailed scrutiny of proposals by a Panel of Assessors. This should take the form of a face-to-face event where details can be discussed and clarified with senior managers of the School and the collaborating organisation, the programme team and School administrators. Members of the collaborating organisation may be invited to participate through video/teleconferencing.

Scrutiny by a Panel of Assessors provides objectivity and externality, and the Panel has the authority to stipulate conditions and make suggestions which should be addressed prior to the formal consideration of the programme documentation by the relevant School committees.
The composition of the Panel of Assessors and format of the scrutiny event must be agreed in advance with the Director of Quality and Academic Standards. The Panel would normally comprise the following members as well as representation from the partner organisation where this is feasible.  

| 1. A convener | An Associate Dean (Quality and Academic Standards) from a different School should be invited to convene the event. |
| 2. Two experienced members of academic staff from a different School | If the proposed programme is to be delivered, wholly or in part, in blended or distance learning modes the Panel of Assessors must include an academic who has knowledge and experience of distance learning. |
| 3. A student representative, nominated by the President or Vice-President (Academia) of the Dundee University Students' Association (DUSA) | This would normally be a member of the DUSA Executive who has received training and guidance from the University’s Quality and Academic Standards Office. |
| 4. A representative from the LLC. | If the proposed programme is to be delivered, wholly or in part, in blended or distance learning modes the Panel of Assessors must include a representative from the Centre for Technology and Innovation in Learning. If the LLC representative is unable to attend the scrutiny event, their written comments on the programme documentation should be considered by the Panel at the event. |
| 5. A representative from the ASC/Careers/EIS hub. | The ASC/Careers/EIS representative will consider aspects of quality enhancement relating to academic skills, English language skills, learning, teaching, and employability. If the ASC/Careers/EIS Hub representative is unable to attend the scrutiny event, their written comments on the programme documentation should be considered by the Panel at the event. |
| 6. A representative from External Relations | The External Relations representative will consider the public-facing information, the approach to marketing and the details concerning student recruitment and admissions. If the External Relations representative is unable to attend the scrutiny event, their written comments on the programme documentation should be considered by the Panel at the event. |
| 7. A representative from Quality and Academic Standards (QAS) | The representative from QAS will consider the quality assurance requirements for the joint, double/multiple or dual award. |
| 8. A representative from Registry | The representative from Registry will consider the specific requirements relating to the status of students on the collaborative programme, the requirements for the student record, assessment/examination |

2 Panel representatives from the partner organisation(s) should not be involved with the leadership or delivery of the proposed programme.
| 9. A representative from the EPDU | The representative from the EPDU will consider the relationship between the proposal to proceed agreed by EBDOG and the academic approval proposal. |
| 10. A minimum of one external subject expert | The development of a new programme must be informed by the views of subject experts from outside the University. If the external subject experts are unable to attend the scrutiny event, their written comments on the programme documentation should be considered by the Panel at the scrutiny event. |

Whilst written comments and questions from Professional Services panel members are acceptable, it is essential that there is representation from QAS, EPDU and Registry at the scrutiny event.

The Panel of Assessors must be provided with all of the relevant programme documentation including:

- the completed PSSI (including the completed ASRS ‘Update My Course’ form);
- all of the component module specifications;
- the completed Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes *pro forma*;
- the approved Rationale and Business Case;
- the Due Diligence Checklist;
- the completed Risk Review and Action Plan; and
- any other supporting information, which must be clearly labelled and referenced.

Where there are commercial sensitivities within the programme Rationale and Business Case a version with redactions or a summarised version should be provided to the Panel so that they are fully acquainted with the context of the academic approval process.

The work of the Panel of Assessors should be supported by the quality manager of the lead School, who will work with the convener of the Panel to ensure appropriate organisation of the scrutiny event and subsequent reporting and management of the outcomes of the event.

Following the scrutiny event the draft programme documentation should be revised (where necessary) taking into account any conditions or suggestions made by the Panel of Assessors. A note of the meeting of the scrutiny event, including the final recommendations, should be recorded by the School quality manager and appended or linked electronically to the draft of the programme documentation to be formally considered by the relevant School committee(s).

### 3.2.6 Formative feedback from Schools, Professional Services, DUSA and senior executives

Once the programme documentation has been developed to meet any conditions and/or recommendations from the scrutiny event there should be an opportunity for further formative feedback from Schools, Professional Services, DUSA and senior executives. The relevant School quality manager should provide the QAS office with the draft PSSI (revised, as necessary, following feedback from the Panel of Assessors), along with all of the relevant module documentation and the completed Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes *pro forma* for wider consultation through posting on the University internet site. The QAS office must also be provided with confirmation that the Rationale and Business Case, due diligence report and risk register have been approved by EBDOG. The procedures detailed at the University E-consultation posting process for new taught provision, changes to taught provision and changes to regulations should be followed. The posting process involves notification to key executives in Professional Services and Schools, DUSA and the Vice- Principals.

*Version 3, May 2018*
The approval documents must be available for consultation for a minimum period of two weeks. Any member of staff or DUSA may:

- discuss any issues with staff who are leading the proposal; and/or
- submit comments on the proposal to the School quality manager.

Members of the e-consultation group are encouraged to consider the draft PSSI, the associated module specifications and the Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes pro forma, and to raise any questions or concerns in order that their formative feedback can inform the formal consideration of the programme documentation by the School. The consultation with Schools, Professional Services, DUSA and senior executives through the posting process should therefore take place before the formal consideration of the programme documentation at the level of the relevant School committee(s) (i.e. the School Quality and Academic Standards Committee (SQASC) and/or the School Board).

3.2.7 Formal consideration of the programme documentation by School committee(s)

The revised programme documentation (the PSSI, the module specifications, the Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes pro forma, the Rationale and Business Case, the Due Diligence Checklist, the Risk Review and Action Plan and the completed ASRS ‘Update My Course’ form), along with a commentary on how the proposal was considered, who was involved and the revisions made as part of the scrutiny and consultation process, should be presented to the relevant School committee(s) (i.e. the SQASC and/or the School Board) to request endorsement from the School for approval of the new collaborative programme.

Once the School(s) has endorsed the proposal for the new collaborative programme through its formal committee structures, the endorsed programme documentation (the PSSI, the module specifications, the Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes pro forma, the Rationale and Business Case and the completed ASRS ‘Update My Course’ form) should be sent to the QAS office so that formal approval by the QASC can be taken forward. The PSSI, the module specifications, the Additional Supporting Information for the Academic Approval of Collaborative Taught Programmes pro forma and the ‘Update My Course’ form must be submitted as separate Word documents. Composite documents or pdfs (other than the Rationale and Business Case) will not be accepted.

3.2.8 Formal academic approval of the proposed new taught programme

The formal academic approval of a new taught programme is the responsibility of the University QASC, acting on behalf of the Senate. Following consideration and endorsement by the School(s) the QASC will review the programme documentation and the process through which the School has endorsed the approval of the proposed programme.

The QASC will make a decision on the approval of new programmes based on the information provided by the School. The QASC will not approve a new collaborative programme if the programme documentation is unsatisfactory; if the information provided by the School is incomplete; or if the expected processes have not been followed.

Academic approval of programmes that are delivered in collaboration with another organisation will not be approved through the University’s emergency powers process under any circumstances.

3.4 Consideration of the legal agreement

A joint, double/multiple or dual degree arrangement must be accompanied by a legal agreement which should be carefully negotiated between the participating institutions and signed by the designated authority from each institution. For the University of Dundee, authorised signatories are described in the Schedule of Delegation. The authorised signatories for international collaboration agreements are the Principal, the Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching), the Vice-Principal...
(International) and the University Secretary. The authorised signatories for UK collaboration agreements are the Vice-Principal and the University Secretary. The agreement must be signed by one of those individuals.

Guidance on the development of the legal agreement will be provided by the University Legal team, who will advise on whether external specialist advice is required. The legal agreement will include, for example, details about: student recruitment; admissions (including English language requirements); student registration; financial arrangements; periods of study at each institution; confirmation that the programme will be taught and assessed in English; student progression; external examining arrangements; arrangements for programme delivery; what each institution is responsible for; intellectual property rights; the programme specification; and data protection. For teaching collaborations outside the European Union, a data processing agreement will also be required.

The formal agreement must be signed by the relevant authorities before students are admitted to a joint, double/multiple or dual degree programme.

4. External examining, moderation and programme boards

4.1. The external examiner(s) and Board of Examiners

At least one external examiner for the collaborative programme must be appointed by the University in accordance with the University’s Policy and Code of Practice on External Examining of Taught Programmes. If the joint, double/multiple or dual award is based on an existing single award programme at the University, the same external examiner(s) may be invited to act as external examiner(s) for the collaborative programme.

The external examiner(s) should have access to all relevant information about the joint, double/multiple or dual award and its constituent modules, including assessment tasks and student outputs from both institutions. The external examiner(s) must be made aware of their expected commitments to oversee the academic standards of the collaborative award as part of their appointment process.

There should be a specific Board of Examiners convened for the joint, double/multiple or dual programme which should normally include members of the programme teams from both institutions and the external examiner(s). Videoconferencing, Skype or teleconferencing may be used as appropriate.

Recommendations from the external examiner(s) must be addressed by both of the institutions. The University School has the principal responsibility for ensuring that the external examiners’ views are considered appropriately and that any resulting actions are taken forward. As with all University of Dundee awards, the reports from the external examiner(s) will also be reviewed annually by the Director of Quality and Academic Standards.

4.2 Internal moderation

Internal moderation of samples of assessed work from the partner institution should also be undertaken on an annual basis so that the relevant University School is satisfied that the academic standards for the award are being maintained.

4.3 Programme Boards

In addition to the Board of Examiners, a Programme Board will be established for each joint, double/multiple or dual programme. This will include staff representatives from each collaborating organisation. The joint Programme Board will have oversight of the operation of the jointly taught programme including all areas relating to quality and academic standards. Videoconferencing, Skype or teleconferencing may be used as appropriate.
5. Monitoring and review of joint, double/multiple or dual awards

5.1 Annual review of quality

Joint, double/multiple or dual programmes should be reviewed on an annual basis in a similar way to all University of Dundee programmes (as described in the University’s Quality Framework). Development of the annual programme report should normally include a visit to the partner institution, and details of the visit should be appended as an appendix to the report.

Arrangements should be made so that the reports and outcomes from annual monitoring and review of modules delivered by the collaborating institution are available to contribute to the annual programme review process at the University of Dundee.

5.2 Annual partnership review

In addition to the annual review of quality, a separate annual partnership review should be carried out for international collaborative programmes to inform the business development work undertaken by the EPDU. The partnership review should be carried out using the template available in EPDU collaborations toolkit, and should be completed in consultation with the EPDU team. The report should be lodged with the EPDU.

5.3 Periodic programme review

The periodic review of a joint, double/multiple or dual degree should be carried out in accordance with the principles and processes set out in the University’s Quality Framework. Periodic review of a collaborative programme should be given special attention and should normally be considered as a distinct entity within the period programme review process. The Director of Quality and Academic Standards will provide advice on the conduct of periodic programme reviews for collaborative programmes on a case-by-case basis as the approach may vary depending on the nature of the collaboration.

5.4 Due diligence and review of the Risk Review and Action Plan

Due diligence enquiries should be refreshed every three years and also where circumstances change (e.g. substantive changes to the management and organisation of the partner DAB(s), changes in the political climate of the country of an international DAB or extension of activities). Both scheduled and ad hoc due diligence enquiries should be accompanied by a review of the Risk Review and Action Plan. A reporting template is available in the EPDU collaborations toolkit, and should be completed in consultation with the EPDU team. The report should be lodged with the EPDU.

5.5 Arrangements for monitoring and review of jointly taught provision with UK-based organisations

To promote efficiency, the University may, on occasion, be prepared to allow certain academic quality policies and procedures of a UK-based collaborating organisation to be used in place of the University’s subject to:

- equivalence with the University’s quality policies and procedures;
- the prior approval of the relevant Associate Dean (Quality and Academic Standards);
- the prior approval of the Vice-Principal (Learning and Teaching); and
- reports being submitted to and considered by the School’s Quality and Academic Standards Committee.

Revised version approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee, 25 September 2017