

# Assessment Guide

## Joint Programmes according to the European Approach



*This document is protected by copyright. It can only be used, evaluated or published with express permission of FIBAA.*

### Quality Assurance Agency

FIBAA is a European, internationally oriented agency for quality assurance and quality development, implementing accreditation procedures at HEIs on the basis of internationally recognised quality criteria. The fundamental assessment criteria for this are based on the principles of the Bologna Declaration as they were laid down in 1999 and later modified. FIBAA conducts the accreditation process with a claim to providing high quality work, transparency, and support for sustainable quality development at HEIs.

### European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes

FIBAA carries out accreditation for joint programmes according to the standards as defined in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (henceforth: the European Approach).<sup>1</sup> Joint programmes are evaluated according to shared components, and the relevant national components.<sup>2</sup>

The European shared components consist of two parts: the assessment criteria (henceforth: Standards) and the assessment procedure (henceforth: 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 (online or offline) and the assessment report. The result is to be accepted in all EHEA countries. Dependent on the national legal framework, the external quality assurance decision should come into force or be recognised in all countries where the programme is offered, as agreed in the Bucharest Communiqué.<sup>3</sup>

### Principles of the Assessment

The agency may supplement the formal outcome and the accreditation decision by recommendations and should give reasons for its decision. In case, a Standard is not fulfilled based on findings from the site visit (online or offline), a recommendation or recommendations will be imposed for developing the programme further. In case the review results in an accreditation decision, accreditation can be granted with or without conditions or it can be denied, based on the evaluation of the Standards (below).

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.eqar.eu/assets/uploads/2018/04/02\\_European\\_Approach\\_QA\\_of\\_Joint\\_Programmes\\_v1\\_0.pdf](https://www.eqar.eu/assets/uploads/2018/04/02_European_Approach_QA_of_Joint_Programmes_v1_0.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The relevant national components include 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 national components refer to 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. [https://ecahe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Workshop\\_conclusions-berlin-2007.pdf](https://ecahe.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Workshop_conclusions-berlin-2007.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/agreed-standards/>

Additionally, a joint programme should be, in the event of its concept accreditation in which only its concept is presented, evaluated like an on-going programme.

As part of the re-accreditation procedure, the measures taken by the HEI in order to comply with the recommendations given in connection with the earlier FIBAA accreditation must be reviewed together with all major changes concerning the joint programme (i.e. changes to the partners of the joint programme, the programme content, credits, staff, equipment, cooperation agreements, etc.).

## **Quality Profile**

Assessment Levels	Excellent	Meets the Standard	Fails to meet the Standard	n.r.
-------------------	-----------	--------------------	----------------------------	------

The Quality Levels define to what extent the Standard has been met:

- Fails to meet the Standard – Does not achieve the given standards.
- Meets the Standard – Achieves the given standards.
- Excellent – Significantly surpasses the given standards to the extent that the Joint programme can be regarded as an outstanding example of best practice regarding the criterion in question
- n.r. – not relevant

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.

# Structure of the Assessment Guide

<b>National requirements of the members of the consortium</b> .....	<b>4</b>
0.1    Germany .....	4
0.2    Cyprus .....	4
0.3    France.....	4
<b>0</b> <b>General Information</b> .....	<b>6</b>
0.1    General information on the Institution(s).....	6
0.2    General information on the joint programme(s).....	6
<b>1</b> <b>Eligibility</b> .....	<b>8</b>
1.1    Status.....	8
1.2    Joint design and delivery.....	8
1.3    Cooperation Agreement.....	9
1.4    Added value.....	9
<b>2</b> <b>Learning outcomes</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1    Level [ESG 1.2] .....	11
2.2    Disciplinary field.....	11
2.3    Achievement [ESG 1.2].....	12
2.4    Regulated profession .....	12
<b>3</b> <b>Study Programme(s)</b> .....	<b>13</b>
3.1    Curriculum [ESG 1.2] .....	13
3.2    Credits .....	13
3.3    Workload.....	14
<b>4</b> <b>Admission and Recognition</b> .....	<b>16</b>
4.1    Admission conditions and procedures [ESG 1.4] .....	16
4.2    Recognition.....	16
<b>5</b> <b>Learning, Teaching and Assessment</b> .....	<b>18</b>
5.1    Learning and teaching [ESG 1.3].....	18
5.2    Assessment of students .....	19
<b>6</b> <b>Student support and services [ESG 1.6]</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>7</b> <b>Resources [ESG 1.5 &amp; 1.6]</b> .....	<b>22</b>
7.1    Staff.....	22
7.2    Facilities.....	23
<b>8</b> <b>Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>9</b> <b>Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1]</b> .....	<b>25</b>
9.1    Quality Assurance in terms of Contents, Processes and Results.....	25
9.2    Stakeholder involvement.....	25
<b>Essential annexes</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Procedure for External Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the EHEA</b> .....	<b>27</b>

## National requirements of the members of the consortium

### Austria

European Approach is available to all higher education institutions. There are no additional criteria that need to be assessed.

### Cyprus

There are no additional criteria that need to be assessed.

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

### France<sup>4</sup>

#### Cases where the evaluation of the joint programme with the European Approach has not been successful link with MESR accreditation

In the vast majority of situations, the European Approach procedure will be separate from the Ministry of Higher Education and Research's (MESR) accreditation procedures. This concerns :

- any joint programme, whether newly created or not, established as part of a specialization within an institution accredited to award national bachelor's or master's degrees. In France, accredited establishments enjoy sufficient autonomy to create the courses of their choice within the framework of the mentions in the national nomenclatures (available in appendix 2). As the Ministry's accreditation relates to the mention, the course is de facto recognized in France;
- any joint programme newly created as a bachelor's or master's degree. It is not compulsory to evaluate institutional degrees conferring bachelor's or master's degrees when they are created. This means that evaluation by the European Approach has no connection with the awarding of degrees at the time of their creation.

Programmes evaluated by the European Approach are not exempt from the Hcéres periodic training evaluation procedure, as the two procedures target different fields of evaluation and have distinct objectives.

#### Cases where the evaluation of the joint programme with the European Approach can be used to MESR accreditation

If an institution wishes to use the European Approach when renewing an institutional diploma conferring a bachelor's or master's degree (5 years after its creation), the European Approach reference framework does not allow the MESR to renew the degree according to French criteria. In fact, two French accreditation criteria are not covered by the European Approach references:

- **Research-based training and**
- **Preparation for professional integration**

In this particular case, the evaluation with the European Approach will have to take these two additional criteria into account if the programme is to benefit from a renewal of the grade it has been awarded.

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

---

<sup>4</sup> [Hcéres - European Approach \(hceres.fr\)](https://www.hceres.fr/)

## Germany

### 1. **Transparency (see Standard 8)**

The study programme, study plan, examination requirements and the prerequisites for admittance including the regulations for compensating disadvantages of handicapped students are documented and published.

### 2. **Equal opportunity (see Standard 4.1, 5.1 and 6)**

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 (if applicable)**

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 (if applicable)**

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.

## Italy

European Approach **not** available to higher education institutions.

## 0 General Information

### 0.1 General information on the Institution(s)

Please describe the degree-awarding and contributing institutions (henceforth: consortium) involved in the joint programme and give a general outline of their positioning in the educational market of their country and the programmes they offer.

Please also give an account of where the joint programme(s) seeking accreditation is/are integrated within the range of programmes offered by the institutions of higher education respectively.

	<i>HEI 1</i>	<i>HEI 2</i>	<i>HEI 3</i>	<i>HEI 4</i>
Full original names of Higher Education Institution(s) (HEIs): (translation in English)				
Country				
Legal status				
Role in the joint programme(s)				
Degree awarding institution (yes/no)				
National/international accreditation status and period.				
HEI partner of European Higher Education Area?				

#### Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment:

- When was/were the involved HEI(s) last accredited in the different partner countries?
- How many accreditation decisions have been taken for the joint programme(s) at hand? Any other forms of external or internal quality assessment that were applied?
- European Approach: fully implemented/applicable in the European partner countries?
- Does the cooperation agreement contain any regulations regarding accreditation?

### 0.2 General information on the joint programme(s)

Higher Education Institution(s) (HEIs):	
Degree Awarding Institution(s):	
Programme name (English and original language):	

<b>Degree title awarded:</b>	
<b>Type Accreditation for Joint Programmes according to European Approach</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept accreditation</li> <li>• Initial accreditation</li> <li>• Re-accreditation</li> </ul>	
<b>Projected study time and number of ECTS credits/national credits assigned to the study programme:</b>	
<b>Specialisations/majors within the joint programme</b>	
<b>Capacity Load (maximum number of study places per cohort):</b>	
<b>Programme cycle starts in:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winter semester</li> <li>• Summer semester</li> <li>• Both winter and summer semester</li> <li>• Other start date: ...</li> </ul>	
<b>For re-accreditation: last accreditation period</b>	

# 1 Eligibility

## 1.1 Status

Please list and explain the status of each institution involved in the joint programme.

### Meets the Standard

The institutions that offer a joint programme are legally recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks enable them to participate in the joint programme and, if applicable, to award a joint degree.

The institutions awarding the degree(s) ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

### Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment

- Are all partners of the consortium entitled to award joint degrees?
- Are all partners state-recognized in their respective countries?
- What type(s) of degree(s) is/are issued in the programme? In case of double degrees: are all degrees associated with the same level of qualifications in the European qualifications frameworks?

## 1.2 Joint design and delivery

Please describe how cooperation between institutions of the consortium is set up and organised. How is the delivery of the study programme(s) developed, implemented and organised?

### Meets the Standard

The joint programme is offered jointly, involving all cooperating institutions in the design and delivery of the programme.

### Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment

- Who was/is responsible for the design and continuous development of the programme? How does this joint process work? Is there a coordinating institution?
- What is the added value of the joint programme delivery? Could the partners offer the programme on their own, too?
- What is the contribution of each partner to the curriculum? Are there any overlaps with other study programmes offered by the institutions?

### 1.3 Cooperation Agreement

Please provide and describe the relevant documentation for the cooperation of the consortium.

#### **Meets the Standard**

The terms and conditions of the joint programme are laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement covers in particular the following issues:

- Type of degree/Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme
- Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.)
- Admission and selection procedures for students
- Teaching language(s)
- Mobility of students and teachers and support for student mobility
- Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.
- Administration of student's data and performance records
- Public information on the programme
- Change in partnership

#### **Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment**

- When and by whom was the agreement closed? Have there been any amendments/supplementary agreements/major changes since then?
- Have all partners signed the agreement, including non-European partners?

### 1.4 Added value

Please describe how the joint programme(s) lead(s) to the following added values:

- Increase(s) internationalisation at the institutions.
- Stimulate(s) multinational collaboration on teaching at a high level and makes cooperation binding.
- Increase(s) transparency between educational systems.
- Develop(s) study and research alternatives in accordance with emerging needs.
- Improve(s) educational and research collaboration.
- Offer(s) students an expanded and innovative arena for learning.
- Increase(s) highly educated candidates' employability and motivation for mobility in a global labour market.
- Increase(s) European and non-European students' interest in the educational programme.
- Increase(s) competence at partner institutions through cooperation and implementation of a best practice system.
- Increase(s) the institution's ability to change in step with emerging needs.
- Contribute(s) to tearing down cultural barriers, both personal and institutional.

**Meets the Standard**

The joint programme(s) demonstrate(s) the added value of offering this joint programme in international perspective.

When a **French partner institution** is involved, the following standards must be considered and evaluated additionally:

- Research-based training
- Preparation for professional integration

**Supporting evidence useful for self-assessment and external assessment**

The assessment of this standard may, for example, rely on the following items:

- relevant strategy documents belonging to the consortium;  
legal text for the foundation of the cooperation between the consortium indicating the coordination, the roles and responsibilities of the partners;
- other national and/or international legal requirements;
- examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures of the consortium
- teaching language(s)
- reports intended for supervisory authorities (management, business or financial audit reports etc.).

## 2 Learning outcomes

### 2.1 Level [ESG 1.2]

Please describe the intended learning outcomes of the joint programme with special focus on the European Framework for Qualification and the relevant national qualification frameworks.

#### **Meets the Standard**

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

The intended learning outcomes are shared by the consortium.

When a **French partner institution** is involved, the following standards must be considered and evaluated additionally:

- Research-based training
- Preparation for professional integration

#### **Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment:**

- What are the intended learning outcomes of the programme?
- Are the ILOs known to the students and accessible to the general public? Where are they published? (programme website, Diploma Supplement, student handbook, official regulations....)
- How does the consortium ensure that the ILOs are in line with the desired qualification level of graduates and with the national and European qualifications frameworks? Were the qualifications frameworks drawn upon in the design of the study programme?
- Have all partners, including non-European partners officially committed themselves to the ILOs, as e.g. as part of the cooperation agreement?
- In what way do the ILOs of the programme reflect the desired qualification level?
- Do the ILOs reflect the main purposes of higher education as defined by the ESG (contributing to the students' employability, preparing students for active citizenship, supporting students in their personal development)?

### 2.2 Disciplinary field

Please describe the disciplinary field and how the joint programme(s) is to be integrated into the disciplinary field. Please describe how the (professional) profile elements, unique selling points etc. of the joint programme(s) and the concrete implementation of the learning objective(s) are matched with each other.

#### **Meets the Standard**

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

#### **Supporting question for the self-assessment and external assessment:**

Do the ILOs comprise the following aspects:

- broadening and deepening knowledge and understanding in one or more disciplinary field(s),
- research skills,
- innovation, application and transfer of knowledge,
- communication, co-operation, professional conduct
- key competencies and lifelong learning
- other skills and competencies?

### 2.3 Achievement [ESG 1.2]

Please describe how (processes, methods and approaches) students shall acquire the intended learning outcomes.

#### **Meets the Standard**

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

#### **Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment:**

- Can the programme consortium provide proof that the students have achieved the intended learning outcomes upon graduation? (As, for example, by means of final theses?)
- Are there any tools applied to monitor the achievement of ILOs (as, for example, graduate surveys)?

### 2.4 Regulated profession

Please describe minimum agreed training conditions with a special focus on European and national frameworks.

***If not applicable, this chapter may be deleted.***

#### **Meets the Standard**

If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC<sup>5</sup>, or relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive, are taken into account.

<sup>5</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2005/36/oj>

### 3 Study Programme(s)

#### 3.1 Curriculum [ESG 1.2]

Please give reasons for the conceptual consistency and inner logic of the joint programme. Please describe the range of courses/modules<sup>6</sup> according to content, scope/duration, requirements, required reading, degree and the qualifications/competencies (outcome oriented) to be achieved.

##### **Meets the Standard**

The structure and content of the curriculum are fit to enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

##### **Supporting evidence useful for the self-assessment and external assessment:**

- Please provide a graphic illustration or a survey chart of the curriculum and its components, either as part of this chapter or as an appendix.

##### **Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:**

- What role do the individual parts of the curriculum (modules/teaching units) play for the achievement of intended learning outcomes? Is there something like a “skills matrix” that relates the ILOs to the curricular components?
- How does the curricular structure support the students’ learning progress?
- In what way do the partner universities contribute to the contents and profile of the study programme? What are their particular roles in the programme?
- In what way are the entrance qualifications of the students accounted for? How does the consortium ensure that students will be able to meet the requirements of the programme from the beginning?

#### 3.2 Credits

Please provide an overview of the curriculum,<sup>7</sup> which shows the modular structure of the programme based on the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS).

##### **Meets the Standard**

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

##### **Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:**

- Are all components of the curriculum credited based on the ECTS?
- How do the students know the number of credits awarded for each educational

---

<sup>6</sup> A template for module descriptions can be downloaded here:

<https://www.fibaa.org/en/accreditation-certification/procedures-at-programme-level/programme-accreditation-according-to-the-international-quality-standards-of-fibaa/>

<sup>7</sup> A template for the curriculum overview can be downloaded here:

[https://www.fibaa.org/fileadmin/redakteur/pdf/PROG/Handreichungen\\_und\\_Vorlagen/Sample\\_curriculum\\_English\\_2021.xls](https://www.fibaa.org/fileadmin/redakteur/pdf/PROG/Handreichungen_und_Vorlagen/Sample_curriculum_English_2021.xls)

- unit? Is there a comprehensive course catalogue or a handbook?
- How does this work for non-European partners whose national systems do not apply ECTS?
- Are the core principles of the ECTS Users' Guide applied consistently? (allocation of credits based on achieved learning outcomes, crediting of educational units based on estimated student work-load)

When a **German partner institution** is involved, the following standards must be considered and evaluated additionally:

**Formal requirements regarding the length and content of studies (if applicable)**

- The standard period of study for full-time study amounts to four, three or two semesters for Master's programmes;
- 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;
- 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.
- The Master's dissertation should range from 15 to 30 ECTS credits.
- 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.

**Formal requirements regarding consecutive or further education programmes (if applicable)**

- Master's programmes should be assigned to one of the categories "consecutive study courses" or "study courses providing further education".
- Consecutive master's programmes are to be structured as study courses which consolidate or extend knowledge, are multi-disciplinary or cover a different subject.
- Further education programmes require qualified practical professional experience of, as a rule, no less than one year.
- The content of the Master's programmes providing further education should take professional experience into account and build on it.

### 3.3 Workload

Please provide the following information:

Projected study time	
Number of Credit Points (CP)	
Workload per CP	
Number of modules/courses	
Number of contact hours	

Please describe the calculations and distribution of the student workload in the individual modules/courses and the distribution of over the time of studying.

**Meets the Standard**

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 (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 programme are monitored.

**Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:**

- Is the student workload appropriate for the qualification level?
- What tools are applied to monitor the student workload on a regular basis (quality surveys, inter-views, round tables etc.)
- What happens if the calculated student workload proves to be inaccurate? Can the credits or the course contents be flexibly adapted?

## 4 Admission and Recognition

### 4.1 Admission conditions and procedures [ESG 1.4]

Please describe the admission conditions and procedures as well as the selection procedure used in the joint programme. Please describe the way the decision on admission is justified, documented and communicated.

#### Meets the Standard

The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in light of the programme's level and discipline.

The decision on admission is based on transparent criteria and it is clearly communicated; rejections are reasoned. The responsibilities are clearly regulated.

When a **German partner institution** is involved, the following standard must be considered and evaluated additionally:

#### Equal opportunity (see Standard 4.1, 5.1 and 6)

- 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.

### 4.2 Recognition

Please describe how the recognition of degrees and periods of study at other HEIs is regulated in accordance with / analogous to the Lisbon Recognition Convention (if ratified by the country); the recognition of periods of practical work, prior learning – insofar intended – is also clearly defined.

#### Meets the Standard

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

#### Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:

- What are the admission requirements, and why were they chosen?
- Are there transparent regulations on student selection and admission?
- Is there a joint admission and selection procedure in which all partners participate, or are there several separate admission procedures? If so, how is it ensured that

the selection criteria are consistently applied?

- Who takes the final decision regarding student selection?
- Where are the students enrolled upon acceptance to the programme?
- Who takes decisions regarding the recognition of prior learning, based on which principles? Are there joint principles for recognition, or do all partners apply their own procedures?

## 5 Learning, Teaching and Assessment

### 5.1 Learning and teaching [ESG 1.3]

Please demonstrate that the learning outcomes are achieved and elaborate the teaching methods and learning approaches. Please describe how the study programme(s) handle(s) a potentially diverse student body and their needs.

#### Meets the Standard

The programme is designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve those.

The diversity of students and their needs are respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of the students.

When a **German partner institution** is involved, the following standard must be considered and evaluated additionally:

#### Equal opportunity (see Standard 4.1, 5.1 and 6)

- 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.

#### Supporting evidence/information useful for self-assessment and external assessment

- Implementation of a student-centred teaching methodology
- Students' competencies relevant for a participation in the disciplinary field
- Integration of practical training
- Implementation of gender equality and non-discrimination policy
- Equality of opportunity illustrated by affirmative actions concerning time and formal standards/requirements throughout the programme and examinations, in particular for students in special circumstances, such as single parents, foreign students, students with a migration background and/or from so-called non-academic backgrounds, etc.

#### Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:

- Is there a constructive alignment within the programme between ILOs, contents/curriculum, as well as the methods of teaching and assessment? How is this achieved?
- What methods of teaching are applied on a regular basis (lectures and seminars, group work, projects, internship placements, case studies...)

- How are the different lingual and cultural backgrounds of the students accounted for in the context of teaching? Is there a strategy for this shared by all partners?
- Who is responsible for providing advice to students in academic matters?

## 5.2 Assessment of students

Please describe where legally binding study and exam regulations are defined. They should contain all necessary rules and procedures and take into account, where applicable, national requirements.

Please describe the type and level of examinations and the final thesis and how this is organised among the consortium.

### Meets the Standard

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

### Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:

- What types of assessment are applied on a regular basis? (written exam, oral exam, multiple choice, papers, lab work, ...)
- How do students know what assessment regulations apply to them at the different partner institutions? Are translated versions of the documents available?
- Are there joint assessment procedures within the programme (for example, in the context of the final Master's thesis)?
- If not, how does the consortium ensure a consistent application of assessment regulations and standards? Are there any legal restrictions as regards the assessment methods applied?
- How are the different grading systems applied by the partner institutions harmonized?

## 6 Student support and services [ESG 1.6]

Please describe how students are supported by the different institutions, their teaching and their administration and how support is organised across the consortium.

### Meets the Standard

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

When a **German partner institution** is involved, the following standard must be considered and evaluated additionally:

### Equal opportunity (see Standard 4.1, 5.1 and 6)

- 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.

### Supporting evidence useful for self-assessment and external assessment

- Equality of opportunity illustrated by affirmative actions concerning time and formal standards/requirements throughout the programme and examinations, in particular for students in special circumstances, such as single parents, foreign students, students with a migration background and/or from so-called non-academic backgrounds, etc.
- Support concerning learning methods (Blended learning, distance learning, e-learning)
- Guidance and support concerning academic achievements and study plans
- Career counselling
- Mental health issues
- Scholarships/ financial support
- Student mobility
- Housing
- Visa services
- Etc.

### Supporting questions for self-assessment and external assessment:

- Are there sufficient student support services at all partner institutions?
- Are there jointly offered services, too? (programme coordinators, programme website, student handbook etc.)
- What is done to cater for the special needs of international students? (support in

finding accom-modation and applying for funding, language classes, extracurricular activities, mentoring/buddy programmes, special introductory courses etc.)

## 7 Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6]

### 7.1 Staff

Please list the number of teaching and administrative staff for each member of the consortium as indicated in the table.

	<i>Name of HEI</i>	<i>Name of HEI</i>	<i>Name of HEI</i>	<i>Name of HEI</i>
Full-time teaching staff				
Part-time teaching staff incl. visiting/adjunct lecturers				
<b>Total number of teaching staff</b>				
<b><i>Among them:</i></b>				
Teaching staff with professional experience				
Teaching staff with international experience				
Number of professors				
Number of associate professors				
Number of assistant professors				
Number of senior lecturers				
Number of lecturers				
PhD holders				
Master degree holders				
Guest lecturers				
Total number of supporting administrative staff				

Please describe the number of teaching staff and administrative staff working in the joint programme(s) at the members of the consortium.

#### **Meets the Standard**

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

#### **Supporting evidence useful for self-assessment and external assessment**

- Academic qualification of the teaching staff corresponding to the requirements and objectives of the study programme(s)
- Selection procedure of eligible candidates
- Pedagogical and didactical qualification of teaching staff
- Practical/international experience of teaching staff
- Further qualification opportunities of the teaching staff and administration

## 7.2 Facilities

**Please list relevant literature and databases provided by each member of the consortium:**

Name of HEI:

- 
- 

Name of HEI:

- 
- 

Name of HEI:

- 
- 

**ETC.**

**Please insert the opening hours of library/libraries:**

Name of HEI:

- 
- 

Name of HEI:

- 
- 

Name of HEI:

- 
- 

**ETC.**

Please describe the quantity, quality, media and IT equipment of teaching and group rooms at each member of the consortium with regard to the needs of the study programme(s), including the access to literature and databases.

### **Meets the Standard**

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

### **Supporting evidence useful for self-assessment and external assessment**

- Photographs from the facilities (Campus, Classrooms, laboratories, dormitories, canteen, other buildings) of the members of the consortium
- Videos from the facilities of the members of the consortium
- Social Media channels, if applicable

## 8 Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]

Please describe how the programme is documented and how and where relevant information is accessible for interested parties.

Please describe how students are informed about the activities during the academic year (what, where, how).

### **Meets the Standard**

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, for instance the interested parties have access to the documentation in electronic form and it provides transparency.

When a **German partner institution** is involved, the standard **Transparency** must be considered and evaluated.

## 9 Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1]

### 9.1 Quality Assurance in terms of Contents, Processes and Results

Please describe how the institutions have formed a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Please describe how appropriate measures are found for continuous quality development.

#### Meets the Standard

The cooperating institutions apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.<sup>8</sup> Responsibilities are clearly shared and coordinated.

### 9.2 Stakeholder involvement

Please describe how a stakeholder evaluation according to a predefined procedure is implemented. Please describe the procedure to discuss the results internally and externally.

#### Meets the Standard

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

#### Supporting questions for the self-assessment and external assessment

- Is there a joint understanding of quality and of quality assurance within the programme?
- What procedures are jointly applied by the cooperating institutions for the quality assurance of the programme? Is this stipulated in the cooperation agreement?
- Which tools and procedures does each partner apply individually?
- Who bears the responsibility for the quality of the programme? Is there a steering board or committee?
- Are the results of quality surveys made known to all cooperating institutions? How are the results used for the monitoring and continuous enhancement of the programme?
- Are the students informed about the outcomes of surveys and about the measures taken in response?
- Are internal and external stakeholders (students, teaching staff, employers, graduates) involved in the quality assurance of the programme? In what ways?
- Is there an alumni network?

---

<sup>8</sup> Please refer to: [https://www.engq.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG\\_2015.pdf](https://www.engq.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf)  
FIBAA Assessment Guide for Joint programmes © 2023

## Essential annexes

Besides the documents referred to under the Standards, the following materials should be added:

<b>Documents</b>	
1.	Cooperation agreement(s) approved (signed) by the consortium partners
2.	Valid regulations for student examination and assessment (in English translation if necessary)
3.	Regulations for student selection and admission
4.	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;
5.	Course catalogue/syllabi, i.e. if available, the ECTS course catalogue; course descriptions
6.	Overview of the curriculum and possible progression paths through the programme
7.	Information/data on teaching capacity, infrastructure and resources
8.	Diploma Supplement
9.	Regulations for the recognition of prior learning
10.	Full academic CVs indicating qualifications and experience of relevant (key) staff involved in the joint programme
11.	Student handbook (if available) and/or other information material for students
12.	Regulations for the organization of internships and practical placements (if applicable)
13.	Quality assurance policy for the programme
14.	Example of the awarded Diploma Supplement
15.	Sample survey questionnaires
16.	Central results and outcomes of quality surveys and monitoring activities (for re-accreditation)
17.	Key statistical data for initial and re-accreditation
18.	For re-accreditation: last experts' report and accreditation decision
19.	3-5 final theses (to be provided in digital form or as hardcopies during the site visit)
20.	Further documents as considered appropriate by the consortium

# Procedure for External Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the EHEA

## 1. Self-Evaluation Report [ESG 2.3]

The external quality assurance procedure is based on a self-evaluation report (SER) jointly submitted by the cooperating institutions. The SER should contain comprehensive information that demonstrates the compliance of the programme with the Standards for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the EHEA (see above).

In addition, the report should contain the necessary information about the respective national frameworks of the cooperating institutions that foreign agencies and experts might need in order to appreciate the context, especially the positioning of the programme within the national higher education systems.

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

## 2. Review Panel [ESG 2.3 & 2.4]

FIBAA will appoint a panel of at least four members. The panel will combine expertise in the relevant subject(s) or discipline(s), including

- 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.

Through their international expertise and experience the panel should be able to take into account the distinctive features of the joint programme. Collectively, the panel should possess knowledge of the HE systems of the HEIs involved and the language(s) of instruction used. The panel should include members from at least two countries involved in the consortium providing the programme. The panel should include at least one student.

FIBAA will ensure the impartiality of the experts and observes fairness towards the applying higher education institutions. To this end, the institutions should have the right to raise well-grounded objections against a panel member, but not a right to veto their appointment.

FIBAA will brief the experts on the review activity, their specific role, and the specifics of the quality assurance procedure. The briefing should focus particularly on the distinctive features of a joint programme.

## 3. Site Visit [ESG 2.3]

The site visit should enable the review panel to discuss the joint programme based on the self-evaluation report and assess whether the programme complies with the Standards (see above). The review will be conducted in English.

The site visit will therefore include discussions with representatives of all cooperating institutions and in particular the management of the institutions and the programme, the staff, the students, and other relevant stakeholders, such as alumni and the professional field.

Although the site visit should normally be restricted to one location, the provision at all locations has to be taken into account.

#### **4. Review Report [ESG 2.3 & 2.6]**

The review panel will prepare a report that contains relevant evidence, analysis and conclusions with regard to the Standards (see above). The report will also contain recommendations for developing the programme further. In case the review results in a formal outcome the review panel will make a recommendation for the decision.

The conclusions and recommendations should pay particular attention to the distinctive features of the joint programme.

The institutions should have the opportunity to comment on a draft version of the review report and request correction of factual errors.

#### **5. Formal Outcomes and Decision [ESG 2.5]**

If required, FIBAA will take a decision on the basis of the review report and the recommendation for the decision, considering the comments by the higher education institutions as appropriate. In case the review results in an accreditation decision, it grants or denies the accreditation (with or without conditions), based on the Standards (above). FIBAA may supplement the formal outcome and the accreditation decision by recommendations.

FIBAA will give reasons for its accreditation decision. This applies in particular for accreditation decisions limited by conditions or negative decisions and for cases where the decision differs from the review panel's conclusions and recommendation for the decision.

#### **6. Appeals [ESG 2.7]**

The institutions have the right to appeal against a formal outcome or an accreditation decision. Therefore, FIBAA has a formalised appeals procedure in place, as described in §12 in the FIBAA Terms and Conditions.

#### **7. Reporting [ESG 2.6]**

FIBAA will publish the review report and, if applicable, the formal outcome or the accreditation decision on its website. In case the review was not conducted in English at least an English summary of the review report and an English version of the decision, including its reasons, should be published.

#### **8. Follow-up [ESG 2.3]**

The agency should agree with the cooperating institutions a follow-up procedure to assess the fulfilment of conditions – if applicable – and/or to evaluate the follow-up actions on recommendations – if applicable.

#### **9. Periodicity [ESG 1.10]**

The joint programme should be reviewed periodically every 6 years, which should be specified in the published decision. If there is an accreditation decision it should be granted – if the decision is positive – for a period of 6 years.<sup>7</sup> During the 6-year period, the agency should be informed about changes in the consortium offering the joint programme.