



APPENDIX 7

JOINT PROGRAMMES SELF-EVALUATION REPORT (SER)¹

1. Consortium

1.1. Partner selection

Partners have been preferentially selected from among the institutions, schools, research groups, or programmes with which good working relationships were already established. If other considerations have influenced partner choice, please comment on this below

All institutions are recognised and/or accredited as higher education institutions in their (sub)national higher education systems

Each institution can legally offer this type of programme (level, orientation, discipline) as a joint programme

The added-value of this joint programme is clear for all potential partners

Comments:

1.2. The consortium agreement

The consortium agreement is signed by the competent authorities of the partner institutions

The consortium agreement ensures the necessary and essential support and commitment from all partners

Comments:

¹ Based on the checklist provided by ECA (European Consortium for Accreditation) in Aerden (2014).

2. Governance

2.1. Coordination

Each partner has identified a local coordinator or programme director

Comments:

2.2. Learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are developed and shared by all partners

The intended learning outcomes align with the corresponding level in the relevant qualifications framework

The intended learning outcomes satisfy the requirements of the joint programme's (research) discipline(s) and, where applicable, the professional field

The relevance of the joint programme's learning outcomes is confirmed by alumni, employers, professional organisations and/or a specific professional field

Comments:

2.3. Financial issues

The consortium recognises the required financial (and administrative) resources

The consortium applies clear and transparent budgeting

Comments:

2.4. Internal quality assurance

The consortium has a common understanding of the joint programme's internal quality assurance system

Responsibilities for internal quality assurance are clearly shared and coordinated.

The consortium's quality assurance policy covers both the academic and administrative aspects of the joint programme

The stakeholders are involved in internal quality assurance activities

Comments:

2.5. External quality assurance (and accreditation)

The joint programme is offered in accordance with the relevant legal frameworks

The joint programme is quality assured and/or accredited as a joint programme

Comments:

2.6. Information provision

The partners agree on the proactive and reactive provision of information

The consortium has a dedicated website

Localised information is easily available

Student information is jointly archived

Comments:

3 Management

3.1. Application

The application procedure is outlined on the joint programme website

Whether the application process is organised centrally or whether it is decentralised, all partners are informed of or have access to the application information

The application procedure is organised transparently for all those involved

The consortium has agreed on responsibilities regarding the verification and evaluation of documents submitted during the application procedure

Comments:

3.2. Selection

All responsibilities for (and in) the selection procedure are clearly assigned

The selection criteria are shared and unambiguously understood by all involved in the selection procedure

The same evaluation scale and decision rules are used when assessing students' applications

Comments:

3.3. Enrolment

It is clear where students are enrolled and, if relevant, registered

The consortium's approach to enrolment and registration takes into consideration the manner in which degree awarding takes place

Student visa requirements of all the relevant countries are taken into consideration when organising enrolment and registration

Comments:

3.4. Tuition fees

The consortium has a common policy on tuition fees

The published fee takes into account any supplementary fees

Tuition waivers are budgeted and determined before applications open

Comments:

3.5. Teaching and learning

The content and structure of the curriculum offered across all partner institutions provides the necessary means for achieving the joint programme's intended learning outcomes

A common thread in the curriculum facilitates mobility throughout the joint programme

A joint teaching methodology supports the jointly offered curriculum

Comments:

3.6. Student assessment

Student assessments are joint programme-specific and applied in a consistent manner

The consortium has a transparent and common policy on grading

An appeals procedure is available for students

Comments:

3.7. Students

Students receive all the necessary and relevant information before (and upon) arrival

The model of student mobility is clearly outlined

The programme provides adequate services to students in order to facilitate mobility

The joint programme has a dedicated alumni network

Comments:

3.8. Degree and diploma supplement

The degree is awarded in accordance with the legal frameworks governing the awarding institutions and is recognised as a degree in the higher education systems of the awarding institutions

The joint degree is awarded in accordance with good practices

Multiple degrees are clearly identified as being awarded by a joint programme

The Diploma Supplement enables individuals with no prior knowledge of the joint programme to fully comprehend the awarded degree(s)

Comments:

4. Evaluation summary and additional notes

Comments: