# GUIDE FOR THE EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL JOINT PROGRAMMES WITHIN THE EUROPEAN APPROACH FRAMEWORK FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE

In accordance with Royal Decree 822/2021, September 28, on the organisation of Higher Education and the procedure for its quality assurance

Directorate for Evaluation and Accreditation

Version 1.0 Approved by the Technical Committee for Evaluation and Accreditation on 21/10/2022

_____

Version Control Register:

| Description | Responsible Area | Date | Version |
|---|---|---|---|
| Initial version approved by CTEyA | Area of International Relations | 29/06/2021 | V0.0 |
| Inclusion of technical changes in the initial version | Area of International Relations | 21/10/2022 | V1.0 |
| | | | |

CONTENT

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In 2015, the EHEA ministers approved the Yerevan Ministerial Communiqué[1] and adopted the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes[2] designed and implemented by two or more European Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). This approach is based on the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG2015[3]), in order to facilitate the external review and the recognition of these programmes at European level, and to promote trust among the HEIs.

In December 2017, the European Council requested member States and the European Commission to launch the establishment of 20 European universities as a 2025 initiative, to promote the European Higher Education international competitiveness[4]. Therefore, the European Universities Initiative is set up in 2019 and 17 alliances were selected which will become 41 in 2020[5]. The design and implementation of joint programmes is one of the main objectives for these alliances, as well as their external quality assurance, which is a responsibility of the QA agencies registered in the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR[6]).

In Spain, in accordance with Royal Decree 822/2021, September 28, on the organisation of official Higher Education and the procedure for its quality assurance, article 5.5, Spanish universities can apply for the verification of a joint study plan, designed between one or several Spanish universities and one or several foreign universities (*referenced in this document as Higher Education Institutions, HEIs*), leading to the achievement of a university official Bachelor, Master or Doctorate Degree, which will be formalised in an agreement and included in the report for its verification.

In conformity with the additional sixth and seventh provisions in this Royal Decree, the HEIs can use the European **Procedure for Quality Assurance of International Joint Programmes** (*referenced in this document as European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes*) with regard to the different phases in the processes for verification, substantial modification and accreditation renewal of the joint degree, provided that the country of the degree coordinating HEI had subscribed this procedure.

Additionally, through the different phases in the process for evaluation of verification, substantial modification and accreditation of the joint degree, it is included the recognition of the evaluation reports issued by the quality assurance agencies registered in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) by the Spanish quality assurance agencies.

For this reason, the Directorate for Evaluation and Accreditation of the Andalusian Agency of Knowledge (AAC-DEVA), which is a full member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA[7]) and it is registered in EQAR[8], provides this Guide for the Evaluation of

[1] http://www.ehea.info/page-ministerial-conference-yerevan-2015
[2] https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/
[3] https://www.enqa.eu/esg-standards-and-guidelines-for-quality-assurance-in-the-european-higher-education-area/
[4] https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/32204/14-final-conclusions-rev1-en.pdf
[5] https://ec.europa.eu/education/education-in-the-eu/european-education-area/european-universities-initiative_en
[6] https://www.eqar.eu/register/agencies/
[7] https://www.enqa.eu/

International Joint Programmes within the European Approach for Quality Assurance, in accordance with the provisions in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes and taking into account the protocol agreed in REACU[9]

The objectives of this document are providing a guide to all the stakeholders engaged in the interpretation of the European Approach for external Quality Assurance of International Inter-University Joint Programmes in the EHEA, as well as including the specificities for its implementation by AAC-DEVA. The aspects covered in this Guide are applied to joint programmes provided for Bachelor, Master and Doctoral Degrees.

This Guide provides two AAC-DEVA´s procedures: the first one describes the recognition of the review reports on international joint programmes using the European Approach issued by other agencies registered in EQAR, and the second one, which defines how to proceed in case AAC-DEVA is selected as the agency coordinating the review.

## 2. DEFINITIONS

According to the *European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes,* a joint programme is considered as an integrated curriculum, coordinated and offered jointly by different Higher Education Institutions from EHEA countries, regardless their recognition as double/multiple, or joint degrees at the respective countries[10]. The type of recognition obtained by joint programmes students will be based on the national legal systems established at the participating institutions ´countries.

It is important to point out that the European Approach only includes joint programmes offered jointly by Higher Education institutions from two or more countries, and does not address the quality assurance of programmes delivered jointly by different institutions from a single country.

## 3. EUROPEAN APPROACH: STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

The standards and guidelines agreed in the European Approach for quality assurance of joint programmes are:

### 1. Eligibility

### 1.1 HEIs Status

The HEIs (consortium, hereinafter) which offer a joint programme should be recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks should enable them to participate in the joint programme, and, if applicable, to award a joint degree. The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong/s to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

---

[8] https://www.eqar.eu/register/agencies/agency/?id=2
[9] http://deva.aac.es/include/files/universidades/titulaciones-conjuntas/REACU-ProtocoloTitulosConjuntosInternacionales.pdf
[10]Definitions and clarifications can be consulted at https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/definitions/ and http://ecahe.eu/latest-publications/publication-joint-programmes-from-a-to-z-guide/

**1.2 Joint Design and Delivery**

The joint programme should be offered jointly, and all the cooperating institutions should participate in the design and delivery of the programme.

**1.3 Cooperation Agreement**

The conditions and terms of the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement signed by the cooperating institutions. This agreement should cover the following issues:

- Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme.
- The partners´ coordination and responsibilities with regard to management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs, income, etc.).
- Admission and selection procedures for students.
- Mobility of students and teachers.
- Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.

**2. Learning Outcomes**

**2.1 Level [ESG 1.2]**

The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualifications framework(s).

**2.2 Disciplinary field**

The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills, and competences in the respective disciplinary field(s).

**2.3 Achievement [ESG 1.2]**

The programme should be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

**2.4 Regulated Professions**

If relevant for a specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2013/55/CE, which modifies de Directive 2005/36/CE, and its future modifications, related to the recognition of professional qualifications, or relevant common training frameworks covered by the Directive, should be taken into account.

**3. Study Programme [ESG 1.2]**

**3.1 Curriculum**

The content and structure of the curriculum should enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes

### 3.2 Credits

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied accordingly and the distribution of credits should be clear.

### 3.3 Workload

A joint bachelor programme will amount to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint Master programme will amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credit ranges according to the FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified.

The workload and the average time to complete the joint programme should be monitored.

## 4. Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4]

### 4.1. Admission

The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate and take into account the programme´s level and discipline.

### 4.2. Recognition

Recognition of qualifications and periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

## 5. Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3]

### 5.1 Learning and Teaching

The programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve them. The diversity of students and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of the potential different cultural realities of the students.

### 5.2 Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently by all partner institutions.

## 6. Student Support [ESG 1.6]

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Specific challenges of mobile students should be taken into account.

## 7. Resources [ESG 1.5 y 1.6]

### 7.1 Staff

The staff should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

**7.2 Facilities**

The facilities provided should be sufficient and adequate taking into account the intended learning outcomes.

**8. Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]**

Relevant information about the programme as admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc., should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

**9. Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1 y part 1]**

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes according to part one of the ESG 2015.

A detailed explanation of each one of these standards is included in the section "Understanding EA"[11] of Erasmus+ Project "Facilitating the implementation of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes – ImpEA"[12].

Standards Equivalence between the European Approach and ESG2015 is summarised in the table below (source: own elaboration):

| ESG2015 | European Approach |
|---|---|
| 1.2 Design and approval of programmes | 2. Learning outcomes<br>3. Study programme |
| 1.4 Student Admission, progression, recognition and certification | 4. Admission and recognition |
| 1.3 Student-Centred learning, teaching and assessment | 5. Learning, teaching and assessment |
| 1.6 Learning resources and student support | 6. Student support |
| 1.5 Teaching staff<br><br>1.6 Learning resources and student support | 7. Resources |
| 1.8. Public information | 8. Transparency and documentation |
| 1.1 Policy for quality assurance<br><br>1.7. Information Management<br><br>1.9. On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes<br><br>1.10. Cyclical external quality assurance | 9. Quality assurance |

---

[11] https://impea.eu/understanding-ea/
[12] https://impea.eu/

## 4. PROCEDURE FOR EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE OF JOINT PROGRAMMES

### 4.1 Recognition of evaluations of joint programmes conducted by other agencies

In accordance with the additional sixth and seventh provisions in RD 822/2021, the review reports issued by the quality assurance agencies registered in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR), will be recognised by the Spanish quality assurance agencies competent to issue the report included in the procedure for the verification of study plans provided in official education (RD 822/2021, article 26).

Therefore, AAC-DEVA, exercising its competencies, will recognise the evaluation of international joint programmes in the EHEA, whenever the country of the coordinating HEI had subscribed the European Approach, and the institutions providing the joint programme had selected a QA agency registered in EQAR, which had carried out the review in accordance with the procedure provided in the European Approach and they had jointly applied for a QA review in compliance with the European Approach procedure. AAC-DEVA will issue a report on the recognition of the evaluation outcome carried out according to the European Approach. This report, in case of a university joint Bachelor degree with a workload in ECTS credits different to the provisions in RD 822/2021, will express a decision on this issue, according to the additional sixth provision, section 4, and seventh provision, section 10. The report will be remitted to the Andalusian HEI participating in the joint programme, the competent body at the Autonomous Community and the Council for Universities, in order to complete the registration process of the joint programme in the Register for Universities, Centres and Degrees (RUCT), as well as to obtain the recognition as an official degree in Spain, in case of being awarded a favourable decision.

The Andalusian University participating in the joint programme will be responsible for:
1. Ensuring compliance with the corresponding procedures in the competent Ministry in Spain and in the Andalusian Government, leading to the national recognition of the joint programme as an official degree in Spain.
2. Providing information to the consortium and the QA agency responsible for the review, on the AAC-DEVA staff responsible for verifying that the evaluation is conducted taking into account the specifics of the Spanish University System (SUE).
3. Making sure AAC-DEVA receives the evaluation report, which should include an assessment on the degree of compliance with the standards and a global evaluation of the joint programme as favourable. The report will be attached to an application form electronically submitted through the General Register provided by the Andalusian Administration.

When AAC-DEVA receives the evaluation report:

1. AAC-DEVA issues either a Favourable or Unfavourable report on the recognition of the evaluation decision, within 30 calendar days.
2. This recognition report is remitted to the Andalusian university participating in the joint programme, to the competent Regional Ministry and the Council for Universities in order to complete the process required on the official registration of the joint programme in the Register

for Universities, Centres and Degrees (RUCT), provided that the evaluation report is Favourable.

The QA agency coordinating the review should publish the evaluation report of the joint programme. Additionally, AAC-DEVA should be informed on the follow-up and accreditation renewal processes.

## 4.2 Evaluations of joint programmes coordinated by AAC-DEVA

In case AAC-DEVA coordinates the review of a joint programme, the consortium establishes the HEI which will be responsible for direct communication with the agency. AAC-DEVA agrees a timeline with the coordinating HEI, including the deadline scheduled for each activity during the review process. Whenever a Spanish university participates in the consortium, this institution will be responsible for the realisation of the required procedures in the competent Ministry and the Andalusian Government, leading to the national recognition of the joint programme as an official degree in Spain.

### 4.2.1 Self-Evaluation Report [ESG 2.3]

The first element in the external quality assurance process of a joint programme is based on a self-evaluation report (SER) jointly submitted by the cooperating institutions. The SER should include comprehensive information demonstrating the programme is compliant with the abovementioned Standards for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (European Approach).

In addition, the report should contain the necessary information about the respective national frameworks of the cooperating institutions that foreign agencies, so that the review panel can analyse the context, especially the positioning of the programme within the national higher education systems.

The SER should explicitly focus on the distinctive feature of the joint programme as a joint effort of higher education institutions from more than one national higher education system.

The SER should be issued preferably in English. Other language use will be agreed between the HEI coordinating the review process and AAC-DEVA. The required translations of documents will be the consortium´s responsibility.

HEIs should fill in the self-evaluation template provided in Annex I.

### 4.2.2 Panel Review Panel [ESG 2.3 y 2.4]

The AAC-DEVA procedure for the selection and appointment of review panels takes into account the ESG2015 and the ECA Principles for the Selection of experts agreed by the European Consortium for Accreditation.

The review panel for the evaluation of compliance with the European Approach is selected according to the criteria of suitability, independence, gender, responsibility, availability and representation, and it is composed of five members selected in collaboration with the QA agencies experts in the HEIs responsible for the joint programme. The panel should have expertise in the academic field of the joint programme, including labour market, and also in quality assurance in Higher Education. It should also

have knowledge on the HEIs Higher Education systems, as well as the language or languages used in the programme. The panel will have members of at least two countries involved in the consortium offering the programme and, at least, a student. AAC-DEVA guarantees the selection of the most appropriate experts with the profiles required to conduct the review.

The review panel composition includes the positions and functions listed below:

- President, who is the spokesperson with AAC-DEVA for the evaluation process and coordinates the work of the panel. Additionally, the President:
  - Reviews the SER
  - Conducts and participates in the site visit
  - Reviews and signs the provisional and final evaluation reports
  - Reviews the allegations to provisional reports
  - Signs the minutes of the review panel meetings
  - Issues the follow-up report
- Secretary, who supports the Presidency in the coordination tasks and:
  - Reviews the SER
  - Participates in the site visit
  - Issues the provisional evaluation report including the panel members feedback
  - Issues the final evaluation report
  - Drafts and signs the minutes of the panel meetings
  - Issues the follow-up report
- Academic Vocal, who:
  - Reviews the SER
  - Participates in the site visit
  - Provides feedback on the provisional and final reports
- Professional/technical Vocal, who:
  - Reviews the SER
  - Participates in the site visit
  - Provides feedback on the provisional and final reports
- Student, who:
  - Reviews the SER
  - Participates in the site visit
  - Provides feedback on the provisional and final reports

The panel is supported by AAC-DEVA staff who does not participate in the review.

Following the selection of the panel, AAC-DEVA notifies the coordinating HEI of its composition and the CV of the members. Within 10 calendar days, the coordinating institution might submit allegations against a panel member, without the right of veto. AAC-DEVA and the agencies participating in the selection of the panel review the allegations and make the appointment of the panel members including the changes that might be required.

The review panel members sign the ethical commitment and attend a specific training course on the evaluation process, their functions and the implementation of the European Approach.

### 4.2.3 Visit [ESG 2.3]

The review process includes a visit that will be, preferably, on-site visit, which, because of force majeure will be an online visit and following AAC-DEVA recommendations for this type of visits.

The presidency, supported by AAC-DEVA´s technical staff, proposes a visit programme including interviews with the representatives of the HEIs involved in the joint programme, particularly, with the institutions and programme direction, teaching staff, students, and other relevant stakeholders, as graduate students and professional representatives.

The visit programme and the particular HEI hosting the visit are agreed with the institution coordinating the review.

The participation in meetings will be preferably face-to-face, unless due to force majeure reasons, when video conferencing systems will be provided by the HEI hosting the visit.

The review panel may request for additional information to the SER to be reviewed during the visit. Therefore, the programme proposal includes the list of documents and additional evidence which should be submitted.

The HEI hosting the visit provides an appropriate facility to host the meeting properly.

### 4.2.4 Review Report [ESG 2.3 y 2.6]

The review panel issues a provisional report, preferably in English, including the individual decisions agreed by the panel members, the documentary evidence submitted, the analysis and relevant conclusions with regard to compliance with the standards provided in the European Approach, and taking into account the SER and the findings on the visit.

Each standard is valued as "achieved, "partially achieved" or "not achieved.

The provisional report includes the good practices detected by the review panel, as well as the aspects which, according to the panel, will improve the joint programme proposal, and, if applicable, the compulsory elements which should be modified in order to obtain a favourable report.

The provisional report is remitted to the coordinating HEI which, within 15 working days since notification, may submit an answer to factual errors, however new documentary evidence cannot be submitted. In case no allegations are presented by the HEIs, the provisional report will be considered as the final evaluation report.

The HEIs answer to the review panel´s provisional report is reviewed and, a final report proposal is issued including a recommendation on the evaluation formal decision which will be remitted to AAC-DEVA.

The review report template is included in Annex II.

### 4.2.5 Formal Outcomes and Decision [ESG 2.5]

Taking into account the recommendation of the review panel, AAC-DEVA´s Director issues the formal decision on the outcome of the evaluation, after hearing the European Approach Reporting Commission, either Favourable or Unfavourable, which is signed by the Director of AAC-DEVA. This formal decision will be valid for 6 years since the signature date. This report, in case of a joint Bachelor degree with a workload different to the amount included in the provisions in RD 822/2021, will issue a decision on this matter, in accordance with the additional sixth provision, section 4, and seventh provision, section 10 in the RD.

DEVA-AAC communicates the formal outcome to the HEI coordinating the evaluation process, which informs the other HEIs involved so that they can carry out the necessary processes in each country for the recognition of the joint programme.

### 4.2.6 Appeals [ESG 2.7]

The institution reviewed has the right to appeal against the aspects of the evaluation process they disagree with, by using the tools provided by the agency, in accordance with the information published on its institutional Web site.

Additionally, the institutions have the right to express their disagreement with regard to the review outcome by submitting a written reasoned document addressed to the Director within 10 days since notification date, including the aspects they request to be reviewed. The review report issued will be analysed by the appeals committee for university programmes whose decision will be unappealable.

If the report is used by the institution to start the process for verification in Spain, if applicable, the appeals will be submitted to the body responsible of this process.

### 4.2.7 Reporting [ESG 2.6]

AAC-DEVA will publish the review report, the formal outcome and the accreditation decision on its website and on the available international databases [13].

### 4.2.8 Follow-Up [ESG 2.3]

Following a favourable evaluation and with the periodicity provided in the review report by AAC-DEVA, the institutions responsible of the joint programme will remit to DEVA-AAC a follow-up report on the joint degree implementation, including the most relevant outcomes (admission, learning outcomes, stakeholders ´satisfaction, etc.), as well as information on how the recommendations included in the review report were attended to and any other significant change in the programme and/or the consortium which delivers the joint degree.

---

[13] https://www.eqar.eu/qa-results/search/by-institution/

The report will be reviewed, preferably by the president and the secretary of the initial evaluation panel, who will issue an assessment report on the implementation of the programme, including recommendations, if appropriate.

### 4.2.9 Periodicity [ESG 1.10]

The joint programme is reviewed periodically every 6 years, so the formal report includes the period of validity of the decision. The consortium is responsible for requesting a new review at least one year before the 6th year of validity of the previous one. In the case of opting for a different QA agency, the consortium must communicate this decision to AAC-DEVA.

Where applicable, the HEIs must communicate to DEVA-AAC the dissolution of the consortium and the mechanisms established for the termination of the joint programme delivery.

**ANNEX I**

**SELF-EVALUATION REPORT**

**Adapted from ImpEA[14]**

[14]http://impea.online/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/SER_template_ImpEA_final.pdf

# Self-Evaluation Report template

**Name of the Programme**

**Name of the Coordinating Institution**

Content

**Glossary**

Please include a list of abbreviations/terms, if applicable.

**Introduction**

Please include a brief general description specifying the objectives, aims and the context of the joint programme and provide a summary on the processes for the creation and development of the programme (i.e. stakeholders commitment), its relevance and the motivation which led to the consortium association.

**Basic information**

Name of the programme:
EQF level:
Degree awarded:
Number of ECTS points:
ISCED field(s) of study:
List of the institutions delivering the programme:

| Name of the institution | Higher Education institution (Yes/No) | Degree awarding institution (Yes/No) | Role in the consortium (i.e. coordinator, etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

**STANDARDS TO BE REVIEWED**

**STANDARD 1: Eligibility**

**1.1. Status**

Please describe and provide documentary evidence on the legal status of the institutions participating in the consortium with regard to their recognition as competent Higher Education entities in their respective countries (ANNEX 1), as well as the applicable legal national frameworks, which entitle them to participate in a joint programme (ANNEX 3).

Status of each institution concerning programme accreditation:

| Name of the institution | Relevant Quality Assurance agency (if applicable) | European Approach allowed | Additional information |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | (Yes/No) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

### 1.2. Joint Design and Delivery

Please describe each partners role in the design and delivery of the programme.

### 1.3  Cooperation Agreement

The cooperation agreement signed by the entities participating in the consortium should be annexed to this self-evaluation report. ( ANNEX 2)

### STANDARD 2:  Learning Outcomes

### 2.1. Level [ESG 1.2]

Please describe the level corresponding to the European Qualification Framework in the EHEA, as well as the national legal frameworks applicable to the intended learning outcomes. (ANNEX 4)

### 2.2. Disciplinary field

Please describe the intended learning outcomes which should comprise knowledge, skills and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

### 2.3. Achievement [ESG 1.2]

Please describe the procedures provided in order to guarantee the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

### 2.4. Regulated Professions

In case of a joint programme leading to a degree required for the practice of a regulated profession, please include the minimum training conditions by the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC and its update 2013/55/EC, or other common training frameworks relevant to the case and established under this Directive.

### STANDARD 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2]

### 3.1. Curriculum

Please describe the study plan structure and content, and explain the reason why they are adequate to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

### 3.2. Credits

Please describe the implementation of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the clear

distribution of credits with regard to the intended learning outcomes.

### 3.3. Workload

Please describe the total student workload, taking into account that a bachelor joint degree will typically amount to 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint master programme will typically amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credits ranges according to FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified.

Please describe the procedure to monitor the student workload and the average time to complete the programme (ANNEXES 5 and 6)

## STANDARD 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4]

### 4.1. Admission

Please describe the admission requirements and students selection procedures, which should be appropriate to the programme level and discipline (ANNEX 7).

### 4.2. Recognition of prior learning

Please describe the procedures provided for the recognition of degrees, qualifications and periods of study (including the recognition of prior learning), which should be applied in line with the Lisbon Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region and subsidiary documents. (ANNEX 8)

## STANDARD 5: Teaching, Learning and Assessment [ESG 1.3]

### 5.1. Teaching and Learning

Please describe the methodology and the learning and teaching approaches provided to achieve   the intended learning outcomes.

Please describe how the diversity of students and their needs are attended to, especially taking into account their potential different cultural backgrounds.

### 5.2. Assessment of Students

Please describe the examinations regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes which should correspond with the intended learning outcomes.

Please describe the procedure related to the specific assessment of mobile students. (ANNEX 9)

## STANDARD 6: Student Support [ESG 1.6]

Please describe how the provided student support services contribute to the achievement of the intended outcomes, as well as the support services delivered to attend to the specific challenges of mobile students.

### STANDARD 7: Resources

#### 7.1. Teaching, Administration and Services Staff

Please provide detailed information about teaching and administration services staff with regard to their sufficiency and adequacy (degree, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme. (ANNEX 10)

#### 7.2 Facilities and material resources

Please describe the facilities provided for the implementation of the joint programme with regard to their sufficiency and adequacy to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

### STANDARD 8: Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]

Please describe and provide detailed information on the programme such as course catalogue, admission requirements and assessment procedures, etc., which should be documented and published, attending to the specific needs of mobile students.

Please provide also information about the way public and potential students might have access to the information on the programme

### STANDARD 9: Quality Assurance

Please describe the joint internal quality assurance processes applied in accordance with the ESG2015, Part1. (ANNEX 11)

#### Annexes

#### Compulsory Annexes

1) Documents supporting the legal status of the partner institutions
2) Cooperation Agreement
3) Documents supporting each partner's legal basis for :
   a) Participating in a joint programme
   b) (Joint) Degrees awarding rights, if applicable
4) List describing the intended learning outcomes, including:
   a) Matrix of alignment with the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA)
   b) Matrix of alignment with applicable national qualifications framework
5) Course syllabi of all partners
6) Structure of the curriculum / study plan
7) Official documents describing admission requirements and selection procedures
8) Official documents related to the procedure for qualifications recognition
9) Students´ assessment regulations
10) Academic staff CVs (all partners)
11) Relevant documents on the internal quality assurance system

12) Diploma Supplement (sample)

**Additional Annexes**

Please include any additional information or documentary evidence that might be relevant to evidence compliance with the standards provided in the European Approach for quality assurance of this joint programme.

**ANNEX II**
**EVALUATION REPORT**

# Evaluation Report by the Review Panel

Name of the Programme
Name of the Coordinating Institution

Evaluation coordinated by AAC-DEVA in accordance with the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes

Content

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Please provide the following information in this section:

- Quality Assurance agency coordinating the review.
- Name of the universities participating in the consortium.
- Joint programme description: number of credits, teaching modality, multidisciplinary aspects, language of teaching, professional skills and academic education provided in the programme.
- Description of the strengths of the programme.
- Detailed and reasoned description of the recommendations for improvement per standard provided by the review panel.
- Just for provisional reports: description of the aspects to be improved in order to obtain a favourable review.

**INTRODUCTION**

Please provide information on:
- A) The procedure conducted for the review process.
- B) Information on the review panel and its activity:
  - Composition of the review panel.
  - Coordination of the review process.
  - Description of the panel visit.
  - Coordination for the review report writing.

**INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME**

Please provide information on both the consortium and the programme.

**ASSESSMENT OF EACH STANDARD**

**STANDARD 1: ELIGIBILITY**

**1.1. Status**

*Guideline*

The Institutions offering a joint programme should be recognised as Higher Education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks should enable them to participate in a joint programme, and, if applicable, to award a joint degree. The institutions awarding the degree/s should ensure that the degree/s belong to the higher education degree system at the countries in which they are based.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel members should analyse whether the documentary evidence provided in the self-evaluation report and the visit (if applicable) is sufficient and adequate to comply with this standard. The assessment provided should be justified and the programme strengths will be outlined.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|
|          |                    |              |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### 1.2. Joint Design and Delivery

*Guideline*

Joint programmes should be offered jointly, involving all the cooperating institutions in the design and delivery of the programme.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess the documentary evidence provided in the self-evaluation report and in the visit (if applicable) and, particularly, the cooperating institutions should certify their participation in:

- The procedures for the design of the integrated curriculum, the joint admission and selection of students.

- The establishment of joint regulations for examinations.

- The design and implementation of joint procedures for quality assurance.

- The development of the participation budget agreed by the consortium.

The assessment should be based on the documentary evidence provided in the self-evaluation report and the findings in the visit. The strengths of the joint programme strengths should be outlined, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|
|          |                    |              |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### 1.3. Cooperation Agreement

*Guideline*

The terms and conditions on the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement should cover in particular the following issues:

- Denomination of the degree/s awarded in the programme.
- Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved with regard to management and financial organisation, (including funding, sharing of costs and income, etc.).
- Admission and selection procedures for students.
- Mobility of students and teachers.
- Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should verify that the cooperation agreement includes the following information and justify its assessment on:

- The legal framework including the cooperating institutions´ rights and obligations.
- The academic programme, mobility paths and periods of realisation.
- Admission and selection procedures, submission of applications for admission, mobility, assessment of achievement, degree/s awarding and recognition and students available services.
- Public available information on the programme, including the online student guide.
- Academic, administration and services staff responsible for mobility.
- Quality assurance, specially the internal quality assurance system.
- Financial management.
- The recognition of the credits awarded and the courses offered by each institution will be established in the cooperation agreement.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**STANDARD 2: LEARNING OUTCOMES**

**2.1. Level**

*Guideline*

The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualification framework(s).

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should verify that the intended learning outcomes are in line with the European and national

frameworks. The assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

## 2.2. Disciplinary field

*Guideline*

The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should verify that the intended learning outcomes are in line with the disciplinary area/field within which the joint programme is provided. Assessment should be justified and include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

## 2.3. Achievement

*Guideline*

The programme should provide the necessary procedures to demonstrate the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should analyse the adequacy of the procedures designed by the joint programme to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|----------|--------------------|--------------| 
|          |                    |              |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

## 2.4. Regulated Professions

*Guideline*

If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/CE, or relevant common training frameworks established under the Directive, should be taken into account.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should verify that the respective European directives have been taken into account in joint programmes leading to a degree required for the practice of a regulated profession. Assessment should be justified, strengths outlined and recommendations should be included, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved | Not applicable |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|----------------| 
|          |                    |              |                |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

## STANDARD 3: STUDY PROGRAMME

## 3.1. Curriculum

*Guideline*

The curriculum structure and content should be adequate to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess if the structure of the joint programme (timeline of subjects and courses) and the content designed are adequate for students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|

|  |  |  |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### 3.2. Credits

*Guideline*

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly and the distribution of credits should be clear.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess the distribution of ECTS per subject/course and analyse whether it is properly applied to every subject. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### 3.3. Workload

*Guideline*

A joint bachelor programme will typically amount to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint master programme will typically amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credits ranges according to the FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates no credit range is specified.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should analyse if the workload is appropriate to achieve the intended learning outcomes in the average time to complete the programme. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**STANDARD 4: ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION**

**4.1. Admission**

*Guideline*

Admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in light of the programme´s level and discipline.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess if the admission requirements are appropriate for the joint programme and, in case of accreditation renewal applications, it should be analysed if these requirements are properly applied. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**4.2. Recognition**

*Guideline*

Recognition of qualifications and periods of studies, (included recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess that the students´ prior learning is properly recognised. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**STANDARD 5: LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT**

**5.1. Learning and teaching**

*Guideline*

The joint programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve them. Student diversity and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of students.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess whether the methodology and educational approach applied in the joint programme are adequate to ensure the students´ learning taking into account their diversity and needs. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**5.2. Assessment of students**

*Guideline*

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently among partner institutions.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should analyse if the examination procedures designed for the joint programme are adequate to assess that the intended learning outcomes are achieved and if they are properly applied. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**STANDARD 6: STUDENT SUPPORT**

*Guideline*

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. They should take into account specific challenges of mobile students.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess if the student support and counselling services are sufficient to facilitate the intended learning outcomes achievement. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**STANDARD 7: RESOURCES**

**7.1. Academic, administration and services staff**

*Guideline*

The staff should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess whether academic staff is sufficient according to number, profiles, category and experience to implement the joint programme. Likewise, it should be assessed if services staff is adequate to implement the joint programme. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### 7.2. Facilities and material resources

*Guideline*

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

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess if the facilities and material resources provided by the consortium are sufficient and adequate for students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### STANDARD 8: TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION

*Guideline*

Relevant information about the programme like admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc., should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should assess that the available public information is sufficient, adequate and accessible to students. Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

### STANDARD 9: QUALITY ASSURANCE

*Guideline*

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with

part one of the ESG2015.

*Analysis of the documentary evidence provided*

The panel should analyse if internal quality assurance processes are applied in the programme to ensure its adequate implementation and continuous improvement, as well as the procedures established to engage stakeholders and measure their degree of satisfaction, the outcomes analysis, and the establishment and implementation of improvement plans.  Assessment should be justified and should include recommendations, if applicable.

*Assessment*

| Achieved | Partially Achieved | Not Achieved |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |

*Recommendations:*

*Aspects that should be improved in order to obtain a positive report:*

**CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION PROPOSAL**

**11.1. Recommendations Summary**

In final reports, a summary table with all the recommendations per standard will be included in this section.

**11.2. The Review Panel Assessment per Standard**

In this section, a summary table including assessment per standard is provided and, just in final reports, an evaluation proposal in terms of favourable or unfavourable.

| STANDARD | | ACHIEVED | PARTIALLY  ACHIEVED | NOT ACHIEVED |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| STANDARD 1. ELIGIBILITY | Status |  |  |  |
|  | Joint Design and Delivery |  |  |  |
|  | Cooperation Agreement |  |  |  |
| STANDARD 2. LEARNING OUTCOMES | Level |  |  |  |
|  | Disciplinary field |  |  |  |
|  | Achievement |  |  |  |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Regulated Professions (if applicable) | | | |
| STANDARD 3. STUDY PROGRAMME | Curriculum | | | |
| | Credits | | | |
| | Workload | | | |
| STANDARD 4. ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION | Admission | | | |
| | Recognition | | | |
| STANDARD 5. LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT | Learning and Teaching | | | |
| | Assessment of Students | | | |
| STANDARD 6.STUDENT SUPPORT | | | | |
| STANDARD 7. RESOURCES | Academic, Administration and Services Staff | | | |
| | Facilities and material resources | | | |
| STANDARD 8. TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION | | | | |
| STANDARD 9. QUALITY ASSURANCE | | | | |

Final evaluation proposal:　　　　FAVOURABLE　　　　　　UNFAVOURABLE

**ANNEXES**

### REVIEW PANEL

A brief description on the panel members´ CVs should be included in this section.

### VISIT PROGRAMME

The visit programme should be included in this section, and, if applicable, any incidental event/s that might have occurred.

**LIST OF EVALUATED DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE AND OTHER ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

This section includes the list of evidences used in the evaluation

**THE PRESIDENCY´S SIGNATURE**                    **THE SECRETARY´S SIGNATURE**

**DATE:**