

Assessment framework for joint programmes



e | c | a

european consortium for accreditation

Assessment framework for joint programmes in single accreditation procedures

Copyright © 2012 by the **European Consortium for Accreditation in higher education**

*All rights reserved. This information may be used freely and copied
for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is acknowledged
(© European Consortium for Accreditation).*

*Additional copies of this publication are available
via www.ecaconsortium.net.*



Table of content

1. Introduction	7
2. General principles	8
3. Shared European component	9
3.1. Assessment criteria	9
3.2. Assessment procedure.....	12
3.2.1. Self-evaluation report.....	12
3.2.2. Composition of the assessment panel.....	12
3.2.3. Site visit.....	13
3.2.4. Assessment report.....	13
3.2.5. Decision-making process	14
4. Additional national components	15
4.1. Belgium (Flanders)	15
4.2. Czech Republic	16
4.3. France.....	16
4.4. Germany.....	17
4.5. Israel.....	18
4.6. Lithuania.....	19
4.7. The Netherlands.....	19
4.8. Norway	22
4.9. Poland	23
4.10. Portugal.....	24
5. The self-evaluation report	25
5.1. Introduction	25
5.2. Outline of the self-evaluation report	26

1. Introduction

Accreditation and quality assurance of joint programmes is a challenge for both the higher education institutions and the quality assurance agencies. The main apparent difficulty is the fact that the programme is organised by higher education institutions from different higher education systems and that each of these systems have their own systems of external quality assurance. This situation creates a burden for joint programmes that need to meet all the expectations arising from these different (and sometimes contradictory) national contexts and legal requirements. The European Consortium for Accreditation in higher education (ECA) aims to facilitate the recognition of accreditation decisions across borders. Regarding joint programmes, ECA intends to substitute the different national accreditation procedures by one single accreditation procedure that can lead to several national accreditation decisions. The single accreditation procedure intends to assess the joint programme as a whole. The results of this procedure, i.e. the self evaluation, the site visit and the assessment report, is to be used for accreditation purposes by the relevant national agencies of the higher education systems in which the joint programme is offered. The developed single procedure will include all elements of the joint offering of the programme.

2. General principles

This assessment framework has been developed to assess joint programmes in one single accreditation procedure. When developing this framework, ECA's Principles for accreditation procedures regarding joint programmes¹ were taken into account. The framework consists of two building blocks: the European shared component and the relevant national components.

The European shared component covers the essential core elements that need to be taken into account in all single accreditation procedures. The national components on the other hand cover particular (sub)national legal requirements. National components are limited to requirements considered to be a precondition to take legal accreditation decisions.

Joint programmes will therefore be assessed according to the elements included in the European shared component and the relevant national components. The relevant national components then refer to all the components of the (sub)national higher education system where the results of the single accreditation procedure will be used for accreditation purposes.

The European shared component includes two parts: the assessment criteria and the assessment procedure. The procedure covers the self-evaluation by the joint programme (i.e. the self-evaluation report and the documentation required), the composition of the panel, the organisation of the site visit and the assessment report.

The national components can include elements that need to be added to the assessment criteria and the assessment procedure. Where relevant, this means that these elements need to be addressed by the joint programme in the self-evaluation report, by the quality assurance agency in the organisation of the procedure and by the assessment panel in their assessment report.

¹ Principles approved by ECA in Berlin on 14 June 2007, www.eaconsortium.net

3. Shared European component

This chapter covers the component of the framework which is included into every single accreditation procedure as a mandatory element. The relevant national components are included in the next chapter.

3.1. Assessment criteria

The assessment criteria included in the European shared component of the *Assessment framework for joint programmes* consist of six standards and each of these standards has three criteria.

Standard 1. General conditions

Criterion 1a: Recognition

The institutions in the consortium are legally recognised as higher education institutions and their respective national legal frameworks allow them to participate in this joint programme.

If the joint programme awards a joint degree then this should be in accordance with the legislation governing the awarding institutions.

Criterion 1b: Cooperation agreement

It is clear from both the cooperation agreement and the subsequent implementation that the partners in the consortium agree on the following points:

- *Overall coordination of the programme and/or sharing of responsibilities;*
- *Admission and selection procedures for students;*
- *Mobility of students and teachers;*
- *Examination regulations, student assessment and recognition of credits in the consortium;*
- *Type of degree (joint, multiple) and awarding modalities;*
- *Teaching language(s);*
- *Coordination and responsibilities regarding internal quality assurance;*
- *Administration of student's data and performance records;*

- *Support for student mobility;*
- *Public information on the programme;*
- *Financial organisation (including sharing of costs and incomes, charging registration and/or tuition fees, grants and fellowships);*
- *Change in partnership.*

Criterion 1c: Added value

The programme can demonstrate the added value of offering this joint programme in international perspective.

Standard 2. Intended learning outcomes

Criterion 2a: Shared

The intended learning outcomes are developed and shared by all partners.

Criterion 2b: Level

The intended learning outcomes align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (the so-called Dublin descriptors) or the European Qualifications Framework.

Criterion 2c: Subject/discipline

The intended learning outcomes comply with the requirements in the subject/discipline and, where applicable, the professional field.

Standard 3. Programme

Criterion 3a: Admission

The admission criteria and selection procedures are in line with the joint programme's level and discipline.

Criterion 3b: Structure

The structure and content of the curriculum and its pedagogical approach correspond with the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 3c: Credits

The distribution of credits is clear.

Standard 4. Internal quality assurance system

Criterion 4a: Common understanding

There is a common understanding of the internal quality assurance system for this joint programme in which responsibilities are clearly shared and coordinated.

Criterion 4b: Stakeholder involvement

The stakeholders (students, staff, employers, graduates, etc.) are involved in the internal quality assurance activities (including graduate surveys and employability issues).

Criterion 4c: Continuous improvement

The effectiveness of the system with regard to the continuous improvement of the programme can be demonstrated.

Standard 5. Facilities and student support

Criterion 5a: Facilities

The facilities provided are sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 5b: Support

The student support provided by the joint programme contributes to the achievement of the learning outcomes and, where applicable, to designing individual study pathways.

Criterion 5c: Services

The programme provides adequate student services to facilitate mobility (e.g. housing, guidance for incoming and outgoing students, visa issues, etc.).

Standard 6. Teaching and learning

Criterion 6a: Staff

The composition of the staff (quantity, qualifications, professional and international experience, etc.) is adequate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 6b: Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achievements of learning outcomes are applied in a consistent manner among partner institutions and oriented to the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 6c: Achievement

The programme can demonstrate that the learning outcomes are achieved.

3.2. Assessment procedure

3.2.1. Self-evaluation report

A single accreditation procedure in actuality starts with the submission of a self-evaluation report. More information and an outline of the self-evaluation report is included in chapter 5. *The self-evaluation report.*

Joint programmes need to take into consideration the relevant national components and, where relevant, include these in the self-evaluation report.

A self-evaluation report has to cover the totality of the joint programme. All the consortium partners should therefore be included in the self-evaluation procedure and the preparation of the self-evaluation report. As is clear from the assessment criteria, this report will put appropriate emphasis on the “jointness” of the programme.

In the self-evaluation report, the joint programme demonstrates how it meets all the criteria of the European shared component and the relevant national component(s).

Additionally, the self-evaluation report should contain basic information about the joint programme and relevant annexes.

3.2.2. Composition of the assessment panel

The selection of experts is in line with ECA’s Principles for the selection of experts². The assessment panel consists of at least four members, of whom one is a student. The panel includes the following mix of expertise:

- Experts with prominent subject-/discipline-specific expertise;
- Expert(s) with experience in quality assurance in higher education;
- Expert(s) with international experience/expertise;
- Experts with knowledge of at least some of the countries in which the joint programme is offered.

The quality assurance agencies of the higher education systems in which the joint programme is offered can suggest experts to the procedure’s coordinating agency. The coordinating agency presents its proposal for the composition of the panel to the

² Principles approved by ECA in Dublin on 2 June 2005, www.eaconsortium.net

Coordination Point. The final panel composition is then agreed among the agencies involved. The assessment panel is subsequently convened by the coordinating agency. The other relevant agencies can also propose observers to the site visit. There can be a maximum of two observers per site visit. The final decision concerning the observers will be taken by the Coordination Point in consultation with the coordinating agency. The Coordination Point will take into account agencies' requirements concerning the recognition of the accreditation decision when taking this decision.

3.2.3. Site visit

The site visit enables the assessment panel to discuss the joint programme and its self-evaluation report with the consortium partners. This site visit should therefore include representatives of the partners who are able to present the totality of the joint programme across all sites, even if not all partners are represented. In some cases, video conferencing can be used to extend the range of persons to be interviewed by the assessment panel. Since the site visit is normally limited to one location, the panel is responsible for determining these site visit requirements.

The choice for the site visit location can depend on several elements. There is a need however to find the right balance between logistical efficiency and procedural necessity. It would, for example, be efficient to organise the site visit at the moment of a consortium meeting.

The practical organisation of the site visit (such as the agenda) follows the coordinating agency's guidelines.

3.2.4. Assessment report

A template is available for the panel's assessment report. This template covers the elements included in the European shared component of this framework. The assessment panel need to take into consideration the relevant national components included in the joint programme's self-evaluation report. Where relevant, these national elements should be accordingly assessed and incorporated into their report.

The template follows the assessment criteria outlined in this framework. The assessment panel is expected to present for each of these criteria their (objective) findings, (subjective)

considerations and conclusion. In addition, and where relevant, the same is done for criteria included via national components. Assessment panels are expected to include in their report recommendations which will enable the joint programme to improve where possible. Finally, the assessment report contains an assessment panel's overall conclusion or recommendation. This forms the basis for all relevant agencies to take decisions.

The coordinating agency facilitates the writing of the assessment report. The final version of the assessment report is sent to the other relevant quality assurance agencies. This is done before any accreditation decision is taken.

3.2.5. Decision-making process

The accreditation decision is taken by each of the quality assurance agencies individually and according to their national legislation. These decisions are based on the outcome of the single accreditation procedure.

The coordinating agency first communicates their intended accreditation decision to the other relevant quality assurance agencies. This enables the coordination of the accreditation decisions when (any of) the other agencies intend to take accreditation decisions soon after receipt of the assessment report.

The overall aim is that similar accreditation decisions are taken by all the quality assurance agencies involved. When questions or issues arise that might lead to different accreditation decisions, the Coordination Point can be asked to organise a consultation and coordination procedure among the relevant quality assurance agencies.

Finally, each quality assurance agency communicates their accreditation decision to the other agencies involved. This decision is then further communicated and published according to the normal national procedures.

In case the consortium or a consortium partner wants to lodge an appeal against an accreditation decision taken by one of the quality assurance agencies, this should be done according to the guidelines and requirements of that quality assurance agency.

4. Additional national components

The national components refer to the elements of the assessment criteria and/or the assessment procedure that need to be included in an external quality assurance and/or accreditation procedure in a specific national or subnational higher education system. Where relevant, this means that these elements need to be addressed by the joint programme in the self-evaluation report (standard 7 and following), by the quality assurance agency in the organisation of the procedure and by the assessment panel in their assessment report.

The national components are presented here by country and in alphabetical order.

4.1. Belgium (Flanders)

Assessment criteria

In order to assess criterion 6c regarding the achievement of learning outcomes, the assessment panel is required to look at students' work which, according to the joint programme (and indicated in the self-evaluation report), demonstrate that their graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. Students' work can here refer to a final thesis but also to other products (work of art, portfolio, etc.).

The assessment panel should select, randomly and differentiated by marks achieved, fifteen students from a list of graduates for the last two completed academic years. For each student selected, the panel examines the meaningful students' work, including the completed and signed assessment forms. These documents will be supplied by the programme prior to the site visit.

The assessment panel includes in the report which students work it has evaluated as a basis to establish whether the learning outcomes are achieved in the programme.

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.2. Czech Republic

Assessment criteria

- a. The joint programme has its „guarantee“ (coordinator) at the Czech partner institution. This refers to a professor or an associate professor who is a full-time employee at the institution and not more than half-time employed at some other institution and whose research and publishing activities are closely connected to the specific joint programme.

Note: If the professor/associate professor is employed at different institutions and the total time is more than 70hrs/week, then s/he can be counted as a PhD holder, not a habilitated teacher.

- b. If substantial changes occurred since the last accreditation (curriculum, subjects, staff, etc.), this has to be stated and described in the reaccreditation application.

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.3. France

Assessment criteria

There are no additional criteria that need to be assessed.

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.4. Germany

Assessment criteria

1. Transparency
 - a. The study programme, course of study, examination requirements and the prerequisites for admittance including the regulations for compensating disadvantages of handicapped students are documented and published.
2. Equal opportunity
 - a. Regulations are provided for compensating disadvantages of handicapped students;
 - b. The interests of handicapped students are taken into consideration throughout the study process;
 - c. Compensating disadvantages of handicapped students with regard to time-related and formal guidelines in the studies as well as in the final performance tests and those during the studies is ensured;
 - d. The concepts of the Higher Education Institution for gender justice and for the promotion of equal opportunities of students in special situations such as students having health impairments, students having children, foreign students, students with migration background and/or from so-called educationally disadvantaged classes are implemented at the level of the programme.
3. Formal requirements regarding the length and content of studies
 - a. The standard period of study for full-time study amounts to four, three or two semesters for Master's programmes;
 - b. A Master's qualification requires 300 ECTS credits including the preceding programmes for the first qualification for entry into a profession. This requirement may be waived in special cases where students can demonstrate that they are suitably qualified;
 - c. Master's programmes require a dissertation, the purpose of which is to demonstrate the ability to deal independently with a problem in the relevant subject area on the basis of academic methods within a set period of time.

- d. The Master’s dissertation should range from 15 to 30 ECTS credits.
 - e. A module (which may comprise content taught within one semester or academic year, or extend over several semesters) is generally concluded with one examination and should account for at least five ECTS credits.
4. Formal requirements regarding consecutive or further education programmes
- a. Master’s programmes should be assigned to one of the categories “consecutive study courses” or “study courses providing further education”.
 - b. Consecutive master’s programmes are to be structured as study courses which consolidate or extend knowledge, are multi-disciplinary or cover a different subject.
 - c. Further education programmes require qualified practical professional experience of, as a rule, no less than one year.
 - d. The content of the Master’s programmes providing further education should take professional experience into account and build on it.

In case these requirements might prevent the accreditation of the joint programme, because they are contrary to other (sub) national accreditation requirements, the German Accreditation Council can allow an agency not to take into account the conflicting requirement. The board of the German Accreditation Council takes this decision after a formal request by the relevant agency.

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.5. Israel

Assessment criteria

- a. The degree awarded to the graduates of the joint programme must be joint academic degrees. The degree must list the institutions on the degree certificate.

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.6. Lithuania

Assessment criteria

- a. The programme aims and learning outcomes are publicly available;
- b. The assessment system of students' performance is publicly available;
- c. The curriculum design meets legal requirements;
- d. The study programme is provided by the staff meeting legal requirements;
- e. The higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme.

Assessment procedure

A Lithuanian higher education institution can submit the assessment report to the Lithuanian accreditation agency (SKVC) as a basis for their request for accreditation of the joint programme. There are three preconditions: (1) the coordinating agency is included in the European Quality Assurance Register; (2) the institution has translated the assessment report into the state language (Lithuanian); and (3) this translated document needs to follow the six areas included in the Lithuanian framework and each of these six areas shall be assessed on a four-point scale.

The coordination point can provide a matrix with the correspondence of the assessment criteria in the European shared component and the additional Lithuanian national component with the criteria in the Lithuanian framework.

4.7. The Netherlands

Assessment criteria

In order to assess criterion 6c regarding the achievement of learning outcomes, the assessment panel is required to look at students' work which, according to the joint programme (and indicated in the self-evaluation report), demonstrate that their graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. Students' work can here refer to a final thesis but also to other products (work of art, portfolio, etc.).

The assessment panel should select, randomly and differentiated by marks achieved, fifteen students from a list of graduates for the last two completed academic years. For each student selected, the panel examines the meaningful students' work, including the completed and signed assessment forms. These documents will be supplied by the programme prior to the site visit.

The assessment panel includes in the report which students work it has evaluated as a basis to establish whether the learning outcomes are achieved in the programme.

Assessment procedure

The assessment panel needs to come to a general conclusion regarding the joint programme. This general conclusion is either unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent and needs to be weighted and substantiated.

The assessment is based on the following definition of generic quality: *the quality that can reasonably be expected in an international perspective from a bachelor's or master's programme.*

Below, each conclusion is defined and illustrated with a number of examples to assist in its operationalisation.

Unsatisfactory

The programme does not offer generic quality and shows serious shortcomings in several areas.

This judgement could be operationalised as follows:

- The level and/or orientation of the learning outcomes do not fit within the (inter)national qualification frameworks and have not been concretised into subject- or programme-specific performance levels.
- The aggregate of curriculum, staff, services and facilities does not constitute an environment conducive to learning.
- The programme lacks a programme-wide, transparent and coherent assessment policy.
- The intended learning outcomes are not being achieved.
- Quality assurance in the programme is not pursued in a systematic manner, which translates into a lack of improvement policy.

Satisfactory

The programme does offer generic quality standards and demonstrates an acceptable level across its entire spectrum.

This judgement could be operationalised as follows:

- The level and/or orientation of the learning outcomes fit within the (inter)national qualification frameworks and have been concretised into subject- or programme-specific performance levels.
- The aggregate of curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitutes an environment conducive to learning which enables students to achieve the learning outcomes.
- The programme has developed a programme-wide, transparent and coherent assessment policy, which, however, is not yet pursued by all parties involved.
- The intended learning outcomes are achieved.
- Quality assurance in the programme is pursued in a systematic manner, which translates into a consistent improvement policy.

Good

The programme systematically exceeds generic quality across its entire spectrum.

This judgement could be operationalised as follows:

- The level and/or orientation of the learning outcomes fit within the (inter)national qualification frameworks and have been concretised into subject- or programme-specific performance levels. These are given a specific interpretation based on the programme's explicit views.
- The aggregate of curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitutes a challenging learning environment.
- The programme has developed a programme-wide, transparent and coherent assessment policy, which is pursued by all parties involved.
- The learning outcomes achieved translate into products that are systematically above average.
- Quality assurance in the programme is pursued in a systematic manner, which translates into a consistent improvement policy that is reflected in a growing quality culture.

Excellent

The programme remarkably exceeds generic quality. It does this systematically and across its entire spectrum and is regarded as an (inter)national example.

This judgement could be operationalised as follows:

- The level and/or orientation of the learning outcomes fit within the (inter)national qualification frameworks and have been concretised into subject- or programme-specific performance levels. These are given a specific interpretation based on the programme's explicit and unique views. The programme serves as an example both nationally and internationally.
- The aggregate of curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitutes an innovative, original learning environment.
- The learning outcomes achieved are of excellent quality and translate into awards and (inter)national publications.
- Quality assurance in the programme is pursued in a systematic manner, which translates into a consistent improvement policy and a strong ability for self-reflection. This is reflected in a robust quality culture.

4.8. Norway

Some of the Norwegian institutions are self-accrediting. This means their joint programmes don't need to be accredited separately. The Norwegian national component is therefore only relevant for joint programmes in which a Norwegian institution that is not self-accrediting takes part.

Assessment criteria

At least 50 per cent of the academic FTEs allotted to the provision (*of the part(s) that are provided by the Norwegian institution(s)*) must be members of the institution's own academic staff. Of these, professors (full or associate) must be represented among those who teach the core elements of the provision. For the different cycles specific demands apply:

- a. For first cycle provision, at least 20 per cent of the relevant discipline community/-ies must have competence as professors (full or associate).

- b. For second cycle provision, at least 10 per cent of the relevant discipline community/-ies must be full professors, and an additional 40 per cent associate professors.
- c. For third cycle provision, PhD or stipend programme for artistic development work, at least 50 per cent of the relevant discipline community/-ies must be full professors, and the rest associate professors.

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.9. Poland

Assessment criteria

- 1. Formal requirements regarding the length of studies
 - a. First cycle studies take at least 180 ECTS;
 - b. Second cycle studies take at least 90 ECTS;
 - c. Five-year long cycle studies take at least 300 ECTS;
 - d. Six-year long cycle studies take at least 360 ECTS;
- 2. Staff requirements
 - a. The minimum core staff consists of at least six teachers which hold the academic title of professor or doktor habilitowany and six teachers which hold the academic degree of Ph.D;
 - b. The members of the minimum core staff have to be full-time employees of the higher education institution that offers the joint programme, and at least since the beginning of the semester. This institution has to be their primary employment;
 - c. Each member of the minimum core staff has to teach at least 30 (for a professor or doktor habilitowany) or 60 hours of class during the academic year and within the programme;

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

4.10. Portugal

Assessment criteria

- a. The number of ECTS credits attributed to the joint master's programme must be in the range from 90 to 120 credits;
- b. The curriculum should include an original dissertation or project, worth at least 35% of the total number of credit units (e.g. 42 credits in a programme of 120 credits);
- c. The majority of the academic staff must hold a PhD degree (for a joint master's programme offered with a Portuguese university) or be a PhD holder or a specialist (for a joint master's programme offered with a Portuguese polytechnic).

Assessment procedure

There are no additional elements that need to be included in the assessment procedure.

5. The self-evaluation report

This chapter outlines the requirements for a self-evaluation report prepared by a joint programmes intending to attain accreditation through a single accreditation procedure. This aims to facilitate the presentation of the outcomes of the joint programme's self-evaluation procedure and make this information easily accessible for the experts in the assessment panel.

5.1. Introduction

The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area underline the importance of internal quality assurance and the fact that all external quality assurance procedures should be based on a programme's or institution's self-evaluation. Your self-evaluation report is therefore an indispensable element of any external quality assurance (and accreditation) procedure.

The self-evaluation should be able to help the joint programme establish its strengths and weaknesses. A self-evaluation report that gives insight into a joint programme's critical reflection on its quality and development, gives the assessment panel the best opportunity to provide valuable feedback and recommendations which go beyond the normal assessment of your programme's quality.

The self-evaluation report should follow the outline included in the following chapter. This outline can, where and if necessary, be amended but only if this improves the readability of the overall self-evaluation report.

For each of the criteria, a joint programme is expected to present how it meets this criterion. If a joint programme doesn't yet meet this criterion, it needs to indicate how it intends to meet it in the short term. Any documents referred to in the self-evaluation report is included as an annex to the self-evaluation report.

5.2. Outline of the self-evaluation report

The self-evaluation report is the joint programme's most important way of providing experts with essential information. The self-evaluation report should be clear and concise and therefore be limited to maximum 30 pages, excluding annexes.

1. Introduction

Note: You can use this introduction to give the experts a first impression of your joint programme. Here you can refer to e.g. historical elements, the consortium (development), degree awarding, future developments, etc.

2. General overview

2.1. Overview of the joint programme

- Name(s) of the qualification
Note: Provide the name(s) of the qualification in original language(s) as recognised in all the relevant legal frameworks (with reference to the relevant legal framework in brackets);
- Number of credits;
- Specialisations (if any);
- ISCED field(s) of study;
- Locations.

2.2. Overview of the consortium

- Partners in the consortium
Note: Full original names of each of the partners in the consortium (and, where relevant, translations in brackets) and its (sub)national higher education system (country/region);
Provide for each of the higher education institutions in the consortium:
 - Legal status;
 - Role in the joint programme;
 - (Joint) degree awarded;

2.3. Overview of relevant external quality assurance

Note: Provide for each of the higher education institutions in the consortium:

- Quality assurance (accreditation) agency
Note: This refers to the competent quality assurance (accreditation) agency (if any);
- Accreditation status (or procedure)
Note: Provide, where applicable, the accreditation status awarded to the (joint) programme by the quality assurance (accreditation) agency included above. If there is no separate status awarded to the joint programme, include here reference to the last (or most relevant) external quality assurance procedure;
- Period of accreditation
Note: Include the period of validity of the current (accreditation) status. This can be a period (from – until) but might also be just a start or expiry date;

3. Assessment criteria

Note: Address how your joint programme meets each of the criteria and do this clear and concise under each of the boxed texts that include the criterion.

Please keep the boxed criteria in the self-evaluation report since it improves its reading for the experts in the assessment panel.

Standard 1. General conditions

Criterion 1a: Recognition

The institutions in the consortium are legally recognised as higher education institutions and their respective national legal frameworks allow them to participate in this joint programme.

If the joint programme awards a joint degree then this should be in accordance with the legislation governing the awarding institutions.

Criterion 1b: Cooperation agreement

It is clear from both the cooperation agreement and the subsequent implementation that the partners in the consortium agree on the following points:

- Overall coordination of the programme and/or sharing of responsibilities;
- Admission and selection procedures for students;
- Mobility of students and teachers;

- Examination regulations, student assessment and recognition of credits in the consortium;
- Type of degree (joint, multiple) and awarding modalities;
- Teaching language(s);
- Coordination and responsibilities regarding internal quality assurance;
- Administration of student's data and performance records;
- Support for student mobility;
- Public information on the programme;
- Financial organisation (including sharing of costs and incomes, charging registration and/or tuition fees, grants and fellowships);
- Change in partnership.

Criterion 1c: Added value

The programme can demonstrate the added value of offering this joint programme in international perspective.

Standard 2. Intended learning outcomes

Criterion 2a: Shared

The intended learning outcomes are developed and shared by all partners.

Criterion 2b: Level

The intended learning outcomes align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (the so-called Dublin descriptors) or the European Qualifications Framework.

Criterion 2c: Subject/discipline

The intended learning outcomes comply with the requirements in the subject/discipline and, where applicable, the professional field.

Standard 3. Programme

Criterion 3a: Admission

The admission criteria and selection procedures are in line with the joint programme's level and discipline.

Criterion 3b: Structure

The structure and content of the curriculum and its pedagogical approach correspond with the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 3c: Credits

The distribution of credits is clear.

Standard 4. Internal quality assurance system

Criterion 4a: Common understanding

There is a common understanding of the internal quality assurance system for this joint programme in which responsibilities are clearly shared and coordinated.

Criterion 4b: Stakeholder involvement

The stakeholders (students, staff, employers, graduates, etc.) are involved in the internal quality assurance activities (including graduate surveys and employability issues).

Criterion 4c: Continuous improvement

The effectiveness of the system with regard to the continuous improvement of the programme can be demonstrated.

Standard 5. Facilities and student support

Criterion 5a: Facilities

The facilities provided are sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 5b: Support

Student support provided by the joint programme contributes to the achievement of the learning outcomes and, where applicable, to designing individual study pathways.

Criterion 5c: Services

The programme provides adequate student services to facilitate mobility (e.g. housing, guidance for incoming and outgoing students, visa issues, etc.).

Standard 6. Teaching and learning

Criterion 6a: Staff

The composition of the staff (quantity, qualifications, professional and international experience, etc.) is adequate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes

Criterion 6b: Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achievements of learning outcomes are applied in a consistent manner among partner institutions and oriented to the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 6c: Achievement

The programme can demonstrate that the learning outcomes are achieved.

Standard 7. National component (country)

Note: Include the assessment criteria of each of the relevant national components under separate standards. Use the name of the country in the title of the standard.

Example: Standard 7. National component (Flanders, Belgium).

4. Annexes

Note: The self-evaluation report should at least include the following annexes:

- The cooperation agreement approved (signed) by the consortium partners;
- The overall learning outcomes of the joint programme and their correspondence with the relevant level descriptors in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (the so-called Dublin descriptors) or the European Qualifications Framework;
- The joint programme's curriculum (i.e. if available, the ECTS course catalogue);
- Qualifications and experience of relevant (key) staff involved in the joint programme;
- One example of the awarded Diploma Supplement;

Note: Any document referred to under the assessment criteria should also be added as an annex.

e | c | a

european consortium for accreditation

www.eacaconsortium.net

www.grossroads.eu