



External evaluation report for the accreditation of a joint study programme¹

Title of the joint study programme

Study cycle

Coordinating institution

Partner higher education institutions

¹ The report shall be drafted in English language. The report should not exceed 25 pages and 12,500 words, annexes excluded.



CONTENTS

I. General information	3
I.1 Information regarding the joint study programme evaluation procedure	3
I.2 Methods used in the evaluation process	3
II. Analysis on the compliance with the evaluation standards	3
1. Eligibility	3
2. Learning outcomes	4
3. Study programme [ESG 1.2]	4
4. Admission and recognition [ESG 1.4]	5
5. Learning, teaching and evaluation [ESG 1.3]	5
6. Support for students [ESG 1.6]	6
7. Resources [ESG 1.5 and 1.6]	6
8. Transparency and documentation [ESG 1.8]	6
9. Quality assurance [ESG 1.1 and part 1]	6
III. SWOT analysis	7
IV. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations	7
V. Conclusions and general recommendations	7
VI. List of annexes	7



I. General information

I.1 Information regarding the joint study programme evaluation procedure

Provide a brief presentation of the context in which this external evaluation report was drafted (type of evaluation; period of evaluation visit; membership of the expert evaluators' panel; technical secretary, etc.), and some details about the partner HEIs and the evaluated joint programme. Focus prevalingly on the aspects specific to the functioning of the higher education study programme in joint format.

Enclose the CVs of the members of the expert evaluators' panel, and the on-site visit schedule.

I.2 Methods used in the evaluation process

Describe the activities and methods used in the external evaluation process, such as:

- Review of the Internal evaluation report for the evaluated joint study programme and its annexes;
- Review of the documents provided by the partner institutions on paper/in electronic form during the evaluation visit (if such documents were requested);
- Review of the documents, data and information available on the website of the partner institutions;
- On-site visit, and manner of including all the locations where activities are conducted under the joint programme;
- Meeting/discussions with all the representatives of partner higher education institutions, as well as with students, teaching staff, employers or other stakeholders.

II. Analysis on the compliance with the evaluation standards

1. Eligibility

1.1 Status²

The institutions that provide a joint study programme should³ be recognised as higher education institutions by their relevant national authorities. Their national legislative systems should allow them to participate in the joint study programme and, if applicable, issue a joint diploma. The institutions awarding the diploma(s) should make sure that the diploma(s) are recognised in the national higher education systems of the countries in which they operate.

1.2 Joint design and implementation

The joint study programme should be offered jointly, involving all the institutions that cooperate in designing and implementing the study programme.

1.3 Cooperation agreement

The terms and conditions regulating the operation of the joint study programme should be detailed in a cooperation agreement. This agreement should specifically include the following aspects:

- Title of the diploma(s) awarded in the programme;
- Coordination and responsibilities of the partners in connection with the management and the financial organisation (including funding, cost and revenue sharing, etc.);
- Student admission and selection procedures;
- Student and teacher mobility;
- Examination rules, student evaluation methods, credit recognition, and diploma awarding procedures within the consortium;

² The analysis was conducted during the preliminary phases before initiation of the external evaluation process. Include the findings from the Report on the compliance with the eligibility requirements.

³ The standards use the common English form "should", with a connotation of requirement and compliance.



- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

2. Learning outcomes

2.1 Qualification level [ESG 1.2]

The envisaged learning outcomes should be aligned with the corresponding level in the Qualification Framework in the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA), but also with the level in the applicable national qualification framework(s).

2.2 Study domain

The envisaged learning outcomes should include knowledge, skills, and competences in that (those) study domain(s).

2.3 Achieving of the learning outcomes [ESG 1.2]

The joint study programme should be able to prove that the envisaged learning outcomes can be achieved by the students.

2.4 Regulated professions

If relevant for the joint study programme, the programme should consider the minimum training conditions agreed and specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC or other relevant joint training framework established in this Directive.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

3. Study programme [ESG 1.2]

3.1 Curriculum

The structure and content of the curriculum should be designed so that it allows the students to achieve the envisaged learning outcomes.

3.2 Transferable 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 corresponds to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS credits; a joint master study programme should have 90 to 120 ECTS credits, but no less than 60 ECTS credits; there is no credit number range specified for joint doctoral study programmes. The workload and the average duration for completing the joint study programme should be monitored.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

4. Admission and recognition [ESG 1.4]

4.1. Student admission

The admission requirements and the selection procedures should be adequate for the level of the study programme and the subject matters included in the curriculum.

4.2. Study recognition

The recognition of the qualifications and study periods (including recognition of previous studies) should be done according to the Lisbon Convention on the recognition of diplomas and related documents.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

5. Learning, teaching and evaluation [ESG 1.3]

5.1 Learning and teaching

The study programme should be designed to correspond to the envisaged learning outcomes, and learning and teaching approaches should be adequate to enable such outcomes to be achieved. Diversity of the students and their needs should be respected and encouraged, especially with regard to the potential cultural differences between students.

5.2 Students' evaluation

The regulations concerning examination and evaluation of the learning outcomes achieved by the students should match the envisaged learning outcomes. These should be applied homogeneously by the partner institutions.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.



6.Support for students [ESG 1.6]

Student support services adequately contribute to achieving the envisaged learning outcomes. These should consider issues that are specific to students participating in a mobility programme.

- *description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;*
- *analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.*
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

7.Resources [ESG 1.5 and 1.6]

7.1 Teaching staff

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

7.2 Infrastructure

The available infrastructure is sufficient and adequate from the point of view of the envisaged learning outcomes.

- *description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;*
- *analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.*
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

8.Transparency and documentation [ESG 1.8]

Relevant information about the programme, such as admission requirements and procedures, list of courses, examination and evaluation procedures, etc. should be well documented and published, taking into account the specific needs of those students who participate in a mobility programme.

9.Quality assurance [ESG 1.1 and part 1]

The cooperating institutions should develop and apply shared internal quality assurance procedures, according to Part I of the ESG⁴.

- *description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit;*
- *analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.*
- Recommendations:

The standard is met/partially met/not met.

⁴ <https://www.aracis.ro/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ESG-in-Romanian-by-ARACIS.pdf>



III. SWOT analysis

IV. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Standard	Judgment	Recommendations

V. Conclusions and general recommendations

Important aspects found during the evaluation should be summarised here, and general conclusions should be presented about the quality of education delivered within the evaluated joint study programme; furthermore, general judgments of the expert evaluators' panel about the partner institutions should be presented here as well.

If necessary, the expert evaluators' panel should propose a decision for granting or maintaining the accreditation of the joint study programme, together with the respective justifications (if the expert evaluators' panel members do not reach a consensus, then each of them can propose and present arguments in favour of his/her own decision variant).

VI. List of annexes

The annexes include information and data substantiating the elements presented in the external evaluation report, which are not available on the websites of the evaluated institutions and, therefore, cannot be referenced in the content of the report through links. The list should include links to the documents included as annexes.

The CVs of the members of the expert evaluators' panel should be enclosed, together with the detailed schedule of the evaluation visit and, if applicable, any documents such as:

- ✓ Documents requested from the partner institutions members of the consortium during the evaluation visit, not included in the internal evaluation file received prior to the visit, which are referred to within the content of the report;
- ✓ Pictures – if relevant aspects/situations are raised regarding the condition of the student residences, cafeterias, premises for teaching and learning activities, library, etc.
- ✓ Screenshots/Print screens of the websites of the consortium partners, proving specific claims in the report, and accompanied by the date when they were accessed and saved.
- ✓ Any other documents relevant to the evaluation process, which are referred to in the report.