

Selection May 2011

EXPERT ASSESSMENT MANUAL

**for the assessment of proposals for
Joint Masters Courses (EMMCs)
and Joint Doctorate Programmes (EMJDs)
(Action 1 A & 1 B)
submitted under the
Erasmus Mundus programme**

Document prepared by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, Unit P4

CONTENTS

Introduction

PART I:

Common aspects applicable to both EMMCs and EMJDs

1. Description of the Action p.5
2. Overview of the Selection procedure p.8
3. Assessment of proposals by independent experts p.9
4. Instructions for the work on remote p.17
5. Use of the online tool. p.19

PART II:

Specificities applicable to assessment of EMMCs or EMJDs

1. Recommendations for the assessment of EMMC Proposals..... p.22
2. Good practices in the implementation of EMMCs p.35
3. Recommendations for the assessment of EMJD Proposals p.47
4. Ethical Issues for EMJDs p.60

Annex: Joint Masters Degrees in European Countries.

INTRODUCTION

The present manual is designed to provide guidance to independent experts when assessing Erasmus Mundus (EM) Action 1 proposals.

The assessment procedure described in **Part I applies to both** Erasmus Mundus Joint Masters Course (Action 1A - hereafter called "EMMCs") and Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate Programme proposals (Action 1B - hereafter called "EMJDs").

Part II is dedicated to the **specific elements** experts must take into account when assessing proposals under each of the two sub-actions.

For the second time this year, applicants were asked to fill in their Action 1 application on line (e-form). The e-form includes:

- i) the application form as such (Parts A to E) as well as its **mandatory attachments**, i.e.
- ii) the applicant's declaration on honour (attachment 1)
- iii) the answers provided to the award criteria (attachment 2).

In addition to the e-form, applicants have been asked to send an electronic version of their application by email. This version must include the three elements of the e-form identified above, as well as all other additional annexes, such as letters of endorsement of partner organisations, copies/models of proposed degrees, proof of degree recognition, diploma supplement, student/doctoral candidate agreement, employment contracts for joint doctorate proposals, etc. (see Instructions for completing the EM Action 1 e-form at http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2011/call_eacea_41_10_en.php).

Although experts will be provided with an access to the e-form, its attachments and all other annexes through the SAYKISS online assessment tool, it is the expert's responsibility to print part or all of these documents if needed.

Finally please note that the assessment of EMMC and EMJD proposals will take place on remote. As a result, this "Experts Assessment Manual" includes specific instructions and recommendations aiming at ensuring the consistency and expected quality of the selection process.

On behalf of the Executive Agency for Education, Audiovisual and Culture (hereafter referred to as "the Agency") I wish you an enjoyable assessment work and remain, together with the EM Action 1 Team, available for support and assistance while carrying out your assessment work.

*Joachim Fronia,
Head of Unit,
Erasmus Mundus and External Cooperation, EACEA*

PART I

Common elements of the assessment procedure applicable to both EMMCs and EMJDs

1. Short description of the Action and relevant documentation

The Erasmus Mundus (EM) programme objective is to promote European higher education, to help improve and enhance the career prospects of students and to promote intercultural understanding through cooperation with Third Countries, in accordance with EU external policy objectives in order to contribute to the sustainable development of Third Countries in the field of higher education.

The Erasmus Mundus programme comprises three actions:

- **Action 1:** Implementation of Joint Programmes at Masters (Action 1A) and Doctorate (Action 1B) levels and award of individual scholarships/fellowships to participate in these programmes;
- **Action 2:** Erasmus Mundus Partnerships;
- **Action 3:** Promotion of European Higher Education.

Action 1 Erasmus Mundus Joint Programmes

Action 1 provides:

- ✓ Support for high-quality joint masters courses (EMMCs-Action 1 A) and doctoral programmes (EMJDs-Action 1 B) offered by a consortium of European and possibly third-country HEIs. Other types of organisations concerned by the content and outcomes of the joint programme can participate in the consortium.
- ✓ Scholarships/fellowships for the third-country and European students/doctoral candidates respectively to follow these Erasmus Mundus joint masters courses and doctoral programmes.
- ✓ Short-term scholarships for third-country and European academics to carry out research or teaching assignments as part of the joint masters programmes.

This Action will foster cooperation between higher education institutions and academic staff in Europe and third countries with a view to creating poles of excellence and providing highly trained human resources. Joint programmes must involve mobility between the institutions of the consortium and lead to the award of recognised joint, double or multiple degrees to successful students / doctoral candidates.

1.1. Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide (2009-2013)

The Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide Chapters 1 to 5 provides information to applicants on the requirements to be fulfilled by all Action 1 proposals (Action 1A EM Masters Courses – and Action 1B EM Joint Doctorates).

The first three Chapters (Chapter 1: Introduction incl. Programme objectives, Chapter 2 Definitions, and Chapter 3 Application and Selection procedure, Exclusion and Selection criteria, Financial conditions) are applicable to both EMMCs and EMJDs.

Chapter 4 is exclusively devoted to EMMCs and includes information on Eligibility criteria and Award Criteria of direct usefulness to experts assessing masters proposals.

Following a similar structure, Chapter 5 is exclusively devoted to EMJDs and also includes information on Eligibility Criteria and Award Criteria that is of direct use for experts assessing doctorate proposals.

The Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide constitutes the basis on which proposals have been prepared and, when approved, are implemented. **It is the experts' duty to read, understand and master the relevant sections of this document and to refer to its specific elements when assessing Action 1 proposals.**

The EM Programme Guide can be downloaded from the following address:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/programme_guide_en.php

1.2. *e*-Form and Instructions

Applicants were asked to fill in an electronic application form (*e*-form) to be submitted through internet. **Instructions for completing their application** were published on the Agency's web site. These documents are available under a specific section "Documents for applicants under Action 1" at:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2011/call_eacea_41_10_en.php

1.3. Frequently asked questions:

The Agency published answers to FAQs on the EACEA website. These FAQs are available at:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/tools/faq_en.php

1.4 Other reference documents

1.4.a *EC Decision N° 1298/2008*

The EM programme for 2009-2013 was adopted by the European Council and the European Parliament in the Decision N° 1298/2008/EC available at:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/about_erasmus_mundus_en.php

1.4.b *Reference documents for joint masters courses (EMMCs)*

- EUA (European University Association) Survey on Masters Degrees in Europe
<http://www.eua.be/publications/>
- Good Practice Report for the Management and Administration of Joint Programmes (JOIMAN)
<https://www.joiman.eu/resources/default.aspx>
- Erasmus Mundus Excellence: Handbook and evaluation website for the implementation of excellent EMMCs
<http://www.emqa.eu/>

1.4.c *Reference documents for joint doctoral programmes (EMJDs)*

- European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers (especially section 2) under:
http://ec.europa.eu/eracareers/pdf/am509774CEE_EN_E4.pdf

- EUA (European University Association) Information material on joint doctorate developments in Europe under:
http://www.eua.be/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Publications/Doctoral_Programmes_in_Europe_s_Universities.pdf
- "Salzburg II Recommendations : European universities' achievements since 2005 in implementing the Salzburg Principles" under:
http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/Salzburg_II_Recommendations.sflb.ashx

2. Overview of the Selection procedure

2.1. Background

The 2011 Erasmus Mundus Call for proposals (EACEA/41/10) was officially published on the 16/12/2010. See call notice published in the Official Journal C 341 at:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2011/call_eacea_41_10_en.php

This call made reference to the procedure and requirements described in the relevant sections of the Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide (see 1.1 above).

Proposals for Joint Master Courses (EMMCs - Action 1A) and Joint Doctorate Programmes (EMJDs – Action 1B) had to be submitted by 29 April 2011.

The newly selected EMMC and EMJD consortia will start their preparatory, promotional and scholarship/fellowship selection activities during the academic year 2011-2012 in order to launch their first joint programme edition in the academic year 2012-2013.

2.2. Milestones of the Selection Procedure

2011 EMMC and EMJD proposals will be selected through a competitive process based on their overall quality and organised in accordance with a seven-step selection procedure:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Step 1. → | Registration and acknowledgement of receipt by the Agency. |
| Step 2. → | Eligibility check performed by the Agency and the National Structures, and when applicable EU Delegations with the objective to ensure that the eligibility requirements mentioned under section 3.1, section 4.2.1 (for EMMCs) and 5.2.1 (for EMJDs) of the Programme Guide are respected. |
| Step 3. → | Assessment against relevant Award Criteria by <u>independent experts</u> including individual assessments, consolidated assessments and panel discussions. |
| Step 4. → | Review of the experts assessment by a “Selection Board” composed of EU high level personalities in the field of higher education with a view to ensuring the highest academic quality. Selection Board members will make a comparative assessment of proposals by looking in particular at the consistency of the experts’ assessments, the European added value of the proposals and their relevance in the light of the objectives of the programme and of the priorities (if any) indicated in the Call for Proposals. |
| Step 5. → | On the basis of the outcomes of the Selection Board meeting, the Evaluation Committee composed of representatives of the Erasmus Mundus Units in the Commission (DG EAC) and the Agency, will prepare a draft selection decision taking into account the opinions issued during steps 2, 3 and 4. |
| Step 6. → | Selection decision by the Agency |
| Step 7. → | Applicants are notified by the Agency about the selection decision. Experts’ assessments are provided to all applicants as part of this notification. |

3. Assessment of proposals by independent experts

3.1 Experts' role and obligations

3.1.1 Experts' obligations:

Experts perform assessments on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They must be **independent, impartial and objective**, and are expected to behave in a professional manner throughout the assessment process.

All the information made available to experts is to be treated as **strictly confidential**. No information on the proposals submitted or on the provisional results of the assessment or selection may be divulged to third parties. Under no circumstances may experts contact an applicant on their own account.

Participants in the selection process are bound to the **objectivity and impartiality**, which means that they should never be guided by personal or national interest or political pressure. Should that not be the case, the expert will be removed from the exercise.

Experts should also check to see that they have no potential interest in any of the proposals they are invited to assess. Examples of **conflict of interest** are: the expert is employed by the applicant (/one of the partner organisations) or works in collaboration with the applicant or one of its partners; the expert is employed by the same institution as the applicant; the expert was involved in the preparation of the proposal; the expert would benefit directly from the proposal being funded or not funded. Prior to their formal appointment, experts have had to declare if, to their best knowledge, they had any interest in one of the proposals submitted under any of the two sub-actions. In addition, at contracting stage and for each of the individual proposals they will assess, they will be asked to sign an absence of conflict of interest declaration.

If, at any time, prior or during the assessment process, experts believe they may have a conflict of interest with one of the proposed that have been allocated to them, they have to inform one of the Agency's staff members without delay, so that, if necessary, the proposal(s) concerned can be allocated to (an)other expert(s).

Since the **experts' comments and recommendations** will be communicated to the applicant at the end of the selection process, experts have the obligation to provide complete, meaningful and useful comments. Although it may be important to describe the most relevant aspects of the proposal, the comments must constitute concrete and substantiated qualitative judgements/assessments and not be a mere description of the factual elements contained in the proposal.

The assessment process must be **completed within the period** which has been communicated to the experts. The timing has been carefully planned and the timetable must be adhered to by all persons concerned. Delays in the submission of individual or consolidated assessments by one single expert can have serious consequences on the entire selection.

As mentioned in the Introduction, the 2011 EM Action 1 selection will be organised as a **paperless exercise**. The application form and its annexes, as well as the individual and consolidated assessments will be provided on electronic version only. As a result, it is the expert's responsibility to print hard copies of some or all if these documents if needed.

Finally and although the Agency will try to allocate proposals for only one of the two sub-actions (i.e. joint Masters or Joint Doctorate Programmes) to each individual experts, this objective cannot be guaranteed for all all experts. As a result, Action 1 **experts are required to master the specific elements of both sub-actions** in order to contribute fully and efficiently to the assessment exercise.

3.1.2 Role of the independent experts

The independent academic experts who will assist the Agency in the assessment of Erasmus Mundus Joint Programmes (EMMCs and EMJDs) proposals have been selected on the basis of work experience. The selection of independent experts takes place on an annual basis, approximately four months before the assessment exercise, among the list of experts who have applied to the Agency's Experts Call for Expressions of Interest (http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about/call_experts/call_experts_2007_en.php)

Their work has a twofold objective:

- To provide the Selection Board and the Evaluation Committee with an qualitative judgment on the proposals that have been submitted and,
- To give recommendations to the applicants. Experts' assessment (comments and recommendations) will be sent to all applicants in order to provide them with feedback on their proposal's quality. Experts are therefore requested to draft these comments with accuracy and care.

Each proposal will be assessed by 2 independent experts identified in accordance with the thematic area concerned. These two experts - identified as "expert 1" and "expert 2" - will operate with the same level of responsibility although "expert 1" will be responsible for drafting and submitting the consolidated assessment on behalf of both experts (see 3.2.3. below);

Experts must have perfect understanding of the relevant reference documents – among which the Programme Guide and the present manual – in order to perform efficiently their assessment work.

They will have to judge each of the proposal against the set of award criteria defined for each of the two sub-actions (EMMC and EMJD) and presented in detail under Part II of the present manual.

This judgment will take the form of comments, recommendations and individual scores, provided for each of the issues addressed under the relevant award criterion.

Experts should make sure that all their comments and recommendations are explicit, transparent, detailed, instructive, complete and in accordance with the scoring proposed. Comments should consist of judgements and not of simple summaries of the proposal. They should be tailored to the assessment of each proposal and therefore not be based on a copy-paste approach from one assessment to another. All aspects of the proposal, relative to the award criteria, should be commented on.

In order to guarantee the assessment coherence between proposals covering related thematic fields, experts (and proposals) will be grouped in three different thematic sectors:

- **Hard Sciences (HS):** including mathematics, physics, chemistry, ICT, engineering, etc.
- **Life Sciences (LS):** including medicine, biology, environmental sciences, etc.
- **Humanities and Social Sc. (HU):** including, history, literature, social and political sciences, business, law, etc.

Within each of these thematic sectors, experts will be led by a lead expert (see section 3.1.3 below). Depending on the assessment needs, some experts may be asked to concentrate exclusively on EMMCs or on EMJDs, while others will assess proposals submitted under both sub-actions.

3.1.3 Role of the Lead experts

For each of the sub actions, three experts with a longstanding experience in assessing European cooperation projects will be appointed as “lead expert” and will monitor the quality and progress of the assessment performed in their respective thematic sector (HS, LS, or HU);

Although lead experts may be asked to assess a limited number of proposals themselves, their main role will be to provide quality assurance, guarantee coherence and monitor progress of individual and consolidated assessments performed by independent experts within their group.

In order to achieve these objectives, lead experts will have to work in close coordination with the experts in their group, as well as with their contact person(s) in the Agency (see section 4 for the practical implementation of the assessment work).

During the consolidation phase in particular, lead experts will collaborate closely with the two individual experts in order to facilitate consensus discussions and ensure the quality, coherence and completeness of the consolidated assessment comments and scores.

If a third assessment is required (see 3.2.3 below) the lead expert may be asked to perform this task.

At the end of the individual and consolidated assessment, lead experts will chair their respective Thematic panel and report back to the General panel of experts (see 3.2.4 below). Finally, they will assist the Selection Board as resource persons whenever the Selection Board needs clarification as to the experts' assessment outcomes.

3.2 The assessment procedure

The table below shows the key dates of the assessment procedure:

| | WHEN | WHAT |
|---|--|--|
| Inception phase | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As from EACEA's formal invitation and prior to the beginning of the assessment; At the briefing session on 06 May (in Brussels for new experts and through audio web means for the other experts) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of the assessment exercise by reading the relevant material (EM Programme Guide, Expert Assessment Manual, etc) and contributing to the assessment of the "case study" Participation to the briefing session "in situ" or on remote |
| Individual assessment phase | 07/05 to 20/05 on remote | Individual assessment by external experts |
| Consensus discussion and draft consolidation phase | 23/05 to 05/06 on remote | Consensus discussions and drafting of the consolidation assessment by experts 1 and 2 |
| Final Consolidation / Panels / Debriefing | 8 to 10/06 at the Agency for all experts and lead experts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalisation and submission of consolidated assessments. Thematic and general panels Debriefing |

3.2.1 Inception phase

All experts selected to assess 2011 EM Action 1 proposals under the call EACEA 41/10 are required to have read and assimilated the content of the present manual as well as the relevant sections of the

Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide and the EM Action 1 application documents in advance of the Briefing session and the actual assessment phase (See relevant links in Section 1).

On Friday 06 of May, the Agency will organise a briefing session during which all experts (some in the Agency's premises, other on remote through audio web means) will be introduced to their respective roles, the assessment procedures and the tools designed to assist them in their assessment work.

3.2.2 Individual Assessment phase

Before starting to assess their first proposal, experts will have to verify whether they have any conflict of interest with any of the applications allocated to them (see section 3.1.1). If experts have a conflict of interest, or in case of doubt, they have to inform one of the Agency's staff members without delay, so that they can assess the nature of the conflict of interest and, if necessary, reallocate the proposal(s) concerned to (an)other expert(s).

The first phase of the assessment work is devoted to individual assessments during which experts are acting individually and independently. They are not allowed to discuss individual proposals with their fellow experts, with the exception of the lead expert who, in close contact with the Agency, can provide advice and/or recommendations on particular aspects of individual proposals.

During this first phase, experts are expected to carry out the following activities for each of the proposals attributed to them:

- ⇒ Analyse the proposal against EM award criteria;
- ⇒ Draft comments and recommendations on each criterion as well as on the application as a whole;
- ⇒ Provide individual scores - from 0 to 5 – for each issue addressed under the relevant award criteria (the online tool will automatically provide the global score – i.e. from 0 to 100 - resulting from the sum of individual scores, weighted in accordance with the importance of the relevant award criteria; see section 3.2.5 below).
- ⇒ Endorse their individual assessments.

See Section 5 for the use of the online assessment tool.

Experts will be asked to assess to what extent the elements covered by the award (sub-)criteria have been addressed by the applicant consortium.

In order to perform this assessment, experts will analyse both the answers provided by their applicant to the award criteria and the information contained in the e-form itself, such as:

- The information provided under sections A. B. and D. for what concerns the expertise of the consortium members (applicant, partners and, if relevant, associated partners), and their capacity to implement the joint programme proposal;
- The validity of the degrees intended to be delivered, as presented under part E¹.
- The quality and soundness of the endorsement letters provided by the partner organisations and, if relevant, the associated partners.

Experts should verify the coherence between the answers given to the award criteria and all the relevant sections of the application.

¹ The validity of the degree(s) proposed to be awarded will be cross checked with the assistance of the Erasmus Mundus National Structure in the country of the degree-awarding Higher Education Institutions (and of EU Delegations for third-country degree awarding institutions).

Experts are not obliged to consult other sources of information than the application form and its mandatory attachments (i.e. declaration on honour and answers to the award criteria). However they are invited to consult additional annexes, especially these ones that were highly recommended (i.e. letters of endorsement/intent from partner organisations, copies/model/proof of recognition of proposed degrees), and other documents or sources of information provided by the applicant in order to **crosscheck, verify or confirm information provided in the application form but not to find new elements that failed to be addressed in it**. As regards proof of recognition of the proposed degrees, experts can consult the table in Annex I in which EM National Structures have provided information on degree recognition in their own country.

The amount of text to be written per award criteria should be about 15-20 lines

3.2.3 Consensus discussions and Consolidated Assessment

When their individual assessment is completed (i.e. both experts have endorsed and submitted their assessment of the same proposal), the two experts concerned will communicate (e.g. via e:mail, phone, skype²) in order to exchange their individual assessment and discuss the application concerned. This exchange should serve the purpose of assuring that:

- ⇒ The two experts have a common understanding of all aspects of the proposal,
- ⇒ Their comments and scores are coherent, for each award criterion and globally.

The consensus discussion must aim at **clarifying possible discrepancies / differences** between the two assessments and **bringing the two assessments and scores closer to each other**

Before opening the consensus discussion on each individual proposal, the Agency, together with the Lead Expert, will assess the coherence between the scores proposed by each of the two experts. In cases of significant divergence between Expert 1 and expert 2 scores (as from 10 points), the Agency will first of all invite both experts to **verify if their divergence is not the result of a misunderstanding in the interpretation of a specific aspect of the award criteria or if a particular aspect of the proposal has not been overlooked by one of two**. If this is not the case, the Agency will decide either to call for a third individual assessment³ or to organise an additional consensus discussion meeting in the Agency, during the "Consolidation, Panels and Debriefing" phase, between the two experts, the Lead Expert concerned and Agency staff.

At the end of the consensus discussion:

"Expert 1" will be provided access to the "consolidated assessment form" that includes for each of the sub-criteria, the comments of both experts and the arithmetical average of their individual scores. Expert 1 will be responsible for drafting the consolidated assessment and for confirming (/amending) the average scores⁴, in close collaboration (/contact) with expert 2 and on the basis of the most relevant / appropriate elements identified in each of the individual assessments.

Expert 1 should not validate the consolidated assessment in the online tool. As indicated in the table under section 3.2, the finalisation, validate and endorsement of consolidated assessments will take place in Brussels during the "Consolidation, Panel and Debriefing phase" (from 08 to -10/06).

² You can login to Skype via the following link: <https://login.skype.com/account/login-form>

³ In this case, the consensus discussion will take place between the two experts (out of the three concerned) who have given the closer scores.

⁴ Although experts may use the arithmetical average of their individual scores for their consolidated assessment, they can also modify this average in accordance with the agreement reached during the consensus discussion.

Experts should make sure that **their consolidated comments and recommendations are clear, objective, transparent, detailed, instructive, complete** and in accordance with the scoring. They should also ensure that they are in line and do not include contradictions. **These comments will be sent out to applicants in annex to the letter notifying them about the selection results.**

3.2.4 Formal Consolidation and Panel Discussions

As indicated under section 3.2.3 above, the "**Formal Consolidation**" will take place in the Agency during the corresponding phase of the selection process (from 08 to 10/06). However, in order to limit the time dedicated to this part of the process the "draft consolidated assessments" must have already been fully discussed and, for the vast majority of cases, agreed between the two experts, leaving only as remaining tasks: the actual submission, the printing and the signing of the final consolidated assessment by the two experts concerned.

However, in some particular cases (i.e. when the experts need further clarifications on specific aspects of the proposal, or when the Agency/Lead Expert/ considers it appropriate), an additional consensus discussion will be organised in the presence of the two individual experts, the lead expert and the Agency. This discussion will aim at clarifying open issues before proceeding with the Formal Consolidation. Even for these cases, the experts concerned will be asked to prepare a draft consolidated assessment sufficiently advanced to prepare the formal consolidation.

Panel discussions will take place at the Agency premises. They will start with Thematic Panel Discussions and be followed by General Panel Discussions.

i) Thematic Panels

During Thematic Panel Discussions, the "top ranked" proposals (corresponding approximately to 150 to 200% of the number of proposals expected to be funded) in each of the six thematic sectors (see 3.1.2) will be discussed. Each thematic group will involve experts who have assessed the proposals in the thematic area concerned and will be chaired by its respective Lead expert. Each proposal will be discussed on the basis of its consolidated assessment and in the presence of the two experts involved.

The purpose of these thematic panel discussions is to ensure coherence and consistency across the expert assessments within the respective sectors as well as to carry out an additional quality check of the proposals.

ii) General Panels

For each of the two sub actions, the three Lead experts will report back from the thematic panel discussions to the general panel, composed of all the experts who have attended the thematic panels. The general panel will concentrate on the top ranked proposals (all sectors together) with the objective of:

- ⇒ comparing the relative merits of proposals with similar/identical scores;
- ⇒ elaborating arguments in favour or against ex-aequo proposals;
- ⇒ discussing individual or generic cases that may need to be brought to the attention of the Selection Board and may be used to define their final selection proposal.

In the context of panel discussions (thematic and general), the panel can decide if it considers appropriate to alter the final score of a proposal by 1 or 2 points maximum (out of total of 100). Although both the thematic and the general panels can propose score alterations, it is only the latter who can formally approve them. Decisions to alter a proposal's score have to be documented in the minutes of the panel discussion. They are taken at general panel level by a simple majority vote of the experts present.

At the end of the panel discussions, the Agency will establish the final ranking list of proposals in each of the sub actions taking into account possible score changes following the panel discussions. The shortlist of proposals (approximately twice the number of proposals expected to be funded) and the corresponding background information (consolidated assessment, relevant statistics, proposals summary, etc.) will be sent to the Selection Board in preparation of their meeting.

3.3 Scoring

For each of the issues addressed under the individual award criteria, experts will be requested to provide a score that reflects their qualitative assessment of the issue concerned.

The following scores can be given: 0, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5. It is not envisaged to give any other score (i.e. neither 0.5, nor other decimals than .5).

When attributing a score to the various criteria, the experts should apply the following guidelines:

| Score | Guidance |
|--|---|
| 0 – the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information | A score of 0 should be given for a criterion if the relevant information would reasonably have been expected by the expert and is not present in the proposal or if the information provided is in contradiction with (/does not fulfil) specific requirements for the sub-action concerned. The specific information missing (/not in line with the action requirements) should be entered in the comments' section. It is anticipated that the score of 0.5 will not be given. |
| 1 – poor | A score of 1.0 or 1.5 should be awarded if the proposal is of poor quality for the criterion in question. This may be because information is incomplete in the view of the expert, not clear or not convincing. Assessment comments for proposals in this category should indicate the areas where the proposal is lacking or is of poor quality and could be improved if subsequently re-submitted. |
| 2 – fair | A score of 2.0 or 2.5 should be awarded where the content of the criterion in question is at a level consistent with that routinely produced by the universities across Europe . There may be some strong and relevant points within the proposal, but there may also be weaknesses and in particular there may be no specific details brought out which singles out the proposal from others. Assessment comments for proposals awarded scores in this range should indicate the areas where the proposal could be improved if subsequently re-submitted. |
| 3 – good | Scores of 3.0 or 3.5 should reflect that the proposal demonstrates overall good features with regard to the award criterion in question (even though it contains some weaknesses) or does not contain features that set it apart from many other good proposals being assessed. |
| 4 – very good | Scores of 4.0 or 4.5 should reflect that the proposal has identifiable features which demonstrate that the proposal is of a high quality with regard to the award criterion in question. There should be features that set the proposal apart from other good quality proposals within the assessment. |
| 5 – excellent | In general, experts should not use the score of 5 unless they feel that the content of the proposal could not be improved. In |

| | |
|--|---|
| | cases where a score of 5 is awarded, the expert should feel confident that there would be a high level of consensus from all experts. Score 5 should correspond to examples of excellent practice and justified as such in the assessment form section dedicated to the "Comments to the Agency" (see 5 below). |
|--|---|

Each criterion has a relative weight. The score of the each of the five award criteria will be calculated on the basis of the relative weight of the criterion. The total score will be a figure between 0 and 100. It will be automatically calculated on the basis of the individual scores provided by the expert.

3.4 Renewals and resubmissions:

Among all EMMC proposals submitted, a number will be proposals introduced by **existing EMMC consortia applying for the renewal of their five-year framework agreement** with the Agency. Renewal proposals have to be assessed on exactly the same grounds as new proposals and there should be **no positive or negative discrimination** in favour or against them. However, when assessing a renewal proposal, experts may ask their contact person at the Agency to provide them with additional information on the existing project in order to verify / confirm information presented in the renewal application.

Finally, some of the applications presented under the 2011 Call for proposals may be **resubmissions of proposals rejected during previous selection rounds**. Before and during the individual assessment phase, the Agency will identify these proposals (through the relevant tick box available in the e-form) and, if applicable, provide the experts during their consensus discussions with the assessment experts' comments and recommendations corresponding to the previous submission(s). The objective is to allow the 2011 experts to a) analyse improvements made by the consortium as compared to the earlier application and b) avoid inconsistencies/contradictions with the experts' comments provided on the previous submission(s).

If, during the assessment of a proposal, an expert believes that it may be a resubmission of a previously rejected proposal (that has not correctly filled in section C.1 of the e-form), they should immediately inform their contact person in the Agency who will do the necessary check and, if applicable, provide with the assessments of the previous submission.

4. Instructions for the work on remote

As indicated in previous chapters of this manual, the assessment of proposals submitted under the 2011 Erasmus Mundus Action 1 Call for Proposals (EACEA/41/10) will take place on remote.

In order to guarantee the efficient implementation of the assessment exercise from a qualitative, quantitative and timing perspective, the remote assessment will require, on the one hand, the use of electronic assessment and communication tools and on the other hand, close collaboration between all parties involved (i.e. the Independent Experts, the Lead Experts and the Erasmus Mundus staff in the Agency).

For their remote assessment work, experts will be provided with

- An access to the Agency online assessment tool (see Section 5 below for further instructions) where they will be able to access the applications allocated to them together with all its annexes, as well as the relevant electronic assessment grid;
- The name and contacts (email and telephone number) of their Lead Expert, their designated contact person(s) in the Agency, and, as from the beginning of the consensus discussion, of the second experts involved in the assessment of their proposals
- A detailed timetable for completing their individual and draft consolidated assessments

In order to facilitate the communication with the lead and second expert, experts are advised to use **“voice over IP” (VOIP) applications** – such as SKYPE⁵ - that provide an efficient and free of charge communication tool through computers via a simple internet connection.

Because most experts may have to fulfil their normal professional (/private) activities during the assessment exercise, it is important that they provide their lead and second experts with **a clear indication of the periods during which they will be available for contacts and exchanges** in relation with the assessment exercise.

During their individual and consolidated assessments, **experts will be expected to follow precisely the detailed procedure and timetable provided to them.**

It is of crucial importance that the time schedule is adhered to by all persons concerned in order for the overall selection process to be completed by the beginning of July 2011 and the applicants informed of its results immediately after.

4.1 Individual Assessment

As mentioned under sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.2, **the experts first task will be to check that they do not have a potential conflict of interest with any of their proposals.** If this was the case, they must immediately inform their contact person(s) in the Agency who will allocate the corresponding proposal(s) to another expert.

- a) After having checked all their proposals and ensured they have no conflict of interest with any of them (see sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.2 above), experts will start to assess their proposals in accordance with the instructions contained in this manual and will record their assessment comments, recommendation and scores in the online assessment tool⁶.

⁵ You can login to Skype via the following link: <https://login.skype.com/account/login-form>

⁶ Experts will be able to record their assessment comments and scores directly in the online assessment tool.

However, for those who prefer to work offline, the Agency will also provide them with an MS Word template for

- b) When they have completed their draft individual assessment, the experts will save their draft assessment in a pdf format (see specific instruction under section 5) and send it by email to the Lead experts for his/her quality check. **Experts are required to submit their individual assessments to their Lead expert on a regular basis, in accordance with the timetable proposed by the Agency.** This will guarantee the efficient implementation of the individual assessment phase and avoid that lead experts are inundated with assessment forms to review on the last days of this first phase of the exercise;
- c) On the basis of the observations provided by their lead expert, experts will revise their individual assessment and, after a final proofreading, will “submit/endorse” their individual assessment in the online assessment tool.
- d) Their final action will consist in saving and sending by email to the lead expert and their Agency contact person(s), the submitted/endorsed version of their individual assessment form.

4.2 Consensus discussion and draft consolidated assessment

At the end of the individual assessment phase, when both individual assessments have been submitted/endorsed in the online assessment tool, experts will be provided with the name and contact details (email, telephone number) of the second expert for each of the proposals they have assessed.

Ensuring and maintaining close (/regular) contacts between the two individual experts and, if necessary, the lead expert, is crucial for the efficient implementation of this phase of the assessment exercise and the use of VOIP applications for this purpose is strongly recommended.

- a) After having received their fellow expert’s contact information, experts will exchange by email their individual assessment form in order to read them carefully and compare them to their own. During this stage of the process, they may have to return to the proposal concerned in order to verify, confirm or counter specific comments included in their fellow expert’s assessment form.
- b) After completion of this independent review of each others' assessment, the two experts will discuss – orally or through email exchanges - the points of divergence between their assessment comments and/or scores. If necessary, they will ask the lead expert and/or their Agency contact person(s) to clarify possible discrepancies (see section 3.2.3 above)
- c.1) If there is agreement on the overall proposal assessment, the expert identified as “expert 1” will draft the consolidated assessment, bringing together the most relevant comments and observations provided by the two experts involved. In this process, “expert 1” will be given access to the electronic “consolidated assessment form” combining both sets of comments as well as the average score for each of them. This arithmetical average can be modified in order to better reflect the consolidated assessment.
- c.2) If the two experts cannot reach an agreement (i.e. by bringing their assessment and scores closer to each other), the Agency in close collaboration with the lead experts will decide on the opportunity to call for a third assessment and/or to organise a specific consensus discussion during the "Formal Consolidation, Panels and Debriefing" phase in the Agency. If only the second option applies, the two experts will nevertheless be requested to prepare a draft consolidation assessment, leaving open the disputed elements for further discussion with the Agency staff and the lead expert.
- d) After finalising the draft consolidated assessment, expert 1 will send a copy of it to expert 2 and to the lead expert. **The submission / endorsement of the consolidated assessment will only take place during the relevant phase in the Agency's premises.**

filling in the initial versions of the draft individual and consolidated assessments (prior to the lead expert's quality check)

5. Use of the online assessment tool

General Remarks

In order to perform their assessment work, experts will be given access via a personal login and password to the Agency's online assessment tool.

Through this tool, they will be able to

- Download the electronic version of the individual proposals allocated to them (eForm, the consortium answers to the award criteria and all annexes⁷),
- Record, save and submit/endorse their individual and consolidated comments, recommendations and score,
- Print out their individual and consolidated assessment.

The sections below describe the most important features of the online assessment tool.

5.1 Accessing individual proposals

After logging to the tool, experts will find the list of proposals that have been allocated to them.

For each of the proposals the list identifies

- The "Type of assessment", i.e. "Expert 1", "Expert 2" or "Consolidation"⁸,
- The proposal reference number,
- The decision proposed by the expert,
- The assessment submission date,
- An hyperlink named "**assess**" that opens the individual assessment screens for the proposal concerned.

5.2 General screen

The "General" screen includes

- some key features of the proposals such as the project title, legal representative and coordinator, the experts' name, decision and global scoring, the technical capacity decision and comments
- A menu displayed on the left hand side of the screen that gives access to the other sections of the assessment tool (see sections 5.2 to 5.7 below)

The *Expert decision* provides the experts with 4 different options, "Highly Recommended", "Recommended", "Acceptable" and "Not Recommended". **We ask you not to use the "Acceptable" option** and to use exclusively the 3 other options. In principle each of these 3 options should correspond to a range in the experts score, i.e.

- Proposals with a score of 80 points or higher should be "Highly recommended",
- Proposals with a score lower than 80 but at least 70 points should be "Recommended",
- Proposals with a score lower than 70 points should be "Not recommended".

Experts are not obliged to respect this range and can propose a higher or a lower "Expert decision" in accordance with their overall assessment of the proposal (in order to raise the attention of the expert

⁷ Experts are reminded that they will not be provided with hard copies of the proposals or their annexes. Experts wishing to work on hard copies will have to ensure they can dispose of the necessary equipment to print the relevant electronic files.

⁸ The "consolidation" assessment will only be displayed to the experts playing the role of "Expert 1" and after the submission of the individual assessment by both experts concerned.

panels or the Selection Board on assessment aspects which are not necessarily reflected in the overall score). In this case they will have to justify this proposed decision during the panels.

The **Technical Capacity** decision and, if applicable, the corresponding comment, refer to the capacity of the applicant consortium to implement the proposal with the expected levels of excellence. In principle, this decision will almost always be "Accepted". However, if the expert has doubts about the technical capacity of the applicant consortium, he/she should select the option "Rejected" or "Clarification" and provide a comment in the comment box just below.

5.3 "Typology" screen

If applicable – i.e. if the proposal addresses directly and concretely one or more of the issues identified under the "Typology" screen -, experts will have to tick the relevant box(es).

On the basis of this information, the Agency will be able to draw up statistics on the identified number of projects covering the specific listed themes.

5.4. "Scoring" screen

The "scoring" screen is the screen in which applicants will have to record their comments and recommendations for each of the five award criteria. They will also have to provide a score for each of the issues addressed under each award criterion.

5.5. "Global comments" screen

In order for the experts' comments to be as instructive and complete as possible, **it is recommended that the text written in the global comments screen is of at least 10 lines**.

Global comments and recommendations should relate **to the experts' assessment of the application as a whole** and focus on **strengths, weaknesses** and **potential** of the proposal. They should provide the applicant (but also the Experts panels, Selection Board and Evaluation Committee) with a summary of the global evaluation of the proposal.

5.6 "Agency Comments" screen

In addition to the comments and recommendations that will be communicated to the applicant, the online assessment tool contains also a specific screen where experts can bring to the attention of the Agency, Experts panels and/or Selection Board issues or aspects of the application that are not necessarily linked to the individual award criteria but may prove useful during the selection process or the monitoring of the project, once approved.

These comments will not be included in the selection notification letter sent to all applicants.

5.7 "Attached documents" screen

Through this screen, experts will be able to download the electronic version of the application form together with its mandatory attachments (incl. answers to the award criteria) and additional annexes.

5.8 Project List

This hyperlink will bring the expert back to the list of proposals allocated to him/her.

PART II

Specificities applicable either to EMMCs or EMJDs

1. Recommendations for the assessment of EMMC proposals

1.A. Introductory remarks on the 2011 EMMC selection

The 2011 selection **success rate** should be approximately 20%, i.e. only one proposal out of five has a chance of being selected.

During their assessment, experts will have to ask themselves two key questions

1. What is the added value of the EMMC proposals from the innovation, academic, research, employability points of view, at EU and worldwide level.
2. Is the proposed joint course excellent, solid, reliable and coherent enough, from the content, organisational and structural points of view, to guarantee that this expected added value will be actually provided?

1.B The EMMC Application form

As mentioned under Section 3, experts will have to assess to what extent all the elements covered by the award criteria have been addressed by the applicant consortium. In order to perform this task they will analyse the specific answers provided to the award criteria, but also all the other information included in the application for and additional annexes. The following section underlines the specific aspects experts should look at when reading the application form

1.B.a Endorsement letters

The inclusion of endorsement letters from all consortium partners, whilst not a mandatory requirement, is highly recommended in the Action 1 application process.

Experts are invited to consult these endorsement letters in order to assess the level of institutional commitment they present and compare them with the information provided in other sections of the application form (section B.2 in particular) and in the answers provided by the applicant to the relevant award criteria.

Endorsement letters are also highly recommended for those associated partners that play a structural (/formal / longstanding) role in the joint programme (e.g. by providing financial support or hosting students regularly or contributing to the joint programme's evaluation).

☛ Information to be used in the assessment of point A.1.6 of the award criteria

1.B.b Sections A. and B.

Sections A and B **have to be filled in by all the EMMC consortium members** (i.e. the applicant and its partners).

Experts should note that **it is not mandatory to fill in Section A and B for associated partners**. However, applicants have been advised to do so if the associated partner plays an important (/formal /structural /longstanding) role in the joint programme (e.g. by acting as regular host organisation for students, by providing financial support through complementary scholarships or through other means, by contributing to the quality assessment of the joint programme, etc.). Experts may find references to other associated partners that will contribute less structurally to the joint programme in the answers

provided by the applicant to the relevant sub-criteria (depending from their respective contribution to the project).

Sections B.2 should be read in detail by the experts when assessing the expertise of the participating organisation in carrying out a joint course. Aspects such as the organisation's track record in implementing international projects, designing and delivering joint international programmes, awarding joint or multiple degrees, working in close cooperation with the socio economic environment, etc., are crucial elements when assessing the solidity, reliability and sustainability potential of the consortium.

The elements of information provided under section B have to be compared (/crosschecked) with the corresponding elements provided under sections D and E, as well as in the answers provided by the applicant to the specific issues addressed under the relevant award criteria.

Experts should note that **section B.3 was only mandatory for the applicant organisation.**

☞ **Information to be used in the assessment of points A.1.5, A.3.1 of the award criteria**

1.B.c Section C.

Section C. contains some factual data on the proposed joint programme, as well as a summary of it.

- **Number of ECTS credits awarded:** EMMC proposals can correspond to 60, 90 or 120 ECTS. Although there is no preference for one of the three options, experts must assess the feasibility of the proposal in relation with the number of ECTS allocated (e.g. does the study programme really require a two-year period, can all the courses proposed reasonably be implemented in one academic year only, etc.?) and verify the coherence throughout the application in the number of ECTS intended to be allocated.

☞ **To be compared with the course description provided under point A.1.3 of the award criteria**

- **Continuation of an existing EMMC:** as mentioned in Section 3.4 above , some of the proposals may have been submitted by existing EMMCs intending to renew their five years framework agreement with the Agency. Although these proposals should be treated exactly as all other proposals, experts should note that even if they are not selected, some of these renewal EMMCs may be offered the possibility to use the Erasmus Mundus Brand Name during their non-funded period on the condition that the global score awarded to their proposal reaches at least 75 points out of 100 (see sections 3.5 and 4.7 of the Programme Guide for more details).
- **Resubmission of a rejected proposal:** as mentioned under Section 3.4, proposals rejected under previous calls for proposals should provide the number of their previously rejected bid so as to allow the Agency and the experts comparing the progress made and ensuring the current and previous comments are coherent and do not contradict each other. Although the Agency will identify all the case in which the applicant has provided the relevant information, **if an expert believes a proposal is a resubmission of a previously rejected one and if the relevant data has not been provided under section C.1, (s)he should inform the Agency for further investigation.**
- **Joint Programme duration and implementation period:** The duration of the EMMC covers the period starting with the beginning of the **first students' mandatory activities** and ending with the official **communication of the final results and the official graduation ceremony**. If some students have to join the programme at an earlier stage –for instance, in order to take intensive language courses –, this period must not be included in the joint programme's duration.

As stated under section 4.2.2 of the EM Programme Guide, the joint programme must start the earliest in August of year "n" (year when the students are selected) and end at the latest in October of the relevant year (depending if the course is of 60, 90 or 120 ECTS). It is the consortium responsibility to ensure, in accordance with the different academic calendars in place in the participating institutions, that the start and end dates fall within the mandatory timeframe.

- **Number of countries visited by the EMMC students during their studies:** The minimum requirement defined in the Programme Decision and Programme Guide is to visit at least two different European countries during the period of the joint programme as stated in section 4.2.2 of the EM Programme Guide. The minimum number of countries to be visited during EMMC activities applies to all enrolled students.

Important aspects to bear in mind when analysing the mobility component:

- Because of the constraint imposed on category B scholarship holders to visit at least two countries different from the one in which they have obtained their last degree, a joint programme offering a mobility in two European countries only could penalize the students from the countries concerned who require at least a third host country in order to be eligible to a category B scholarship.
- Although third country universities can act as full partners in an EMMC consortium and be involved in the delivery and recognition of the course, a mobility track involving only one European and one third-country host institution would not be eligible in accordance with the requirement defined in the Programme Decision.
- Although multiple mandatory mobility can be considered as a positive element from the socio-cultural and personal development points of view (or even a necessity for some Category B scholarship holders or when a third-country HEI is involved, as explained above), experts should verify that the positive aspects of these mobility requirements are not detrimental to the students' dedication to their masters course studies.

☞ **The number of countries visited should be compared with the information provided under point A.1.3 of the award criteria**

- **EMMC Tuition language:** EMMC consortia are free to determine the tuition language(s) of their joint study programme. However, the choice of language(s) may have an impact on the number of student applications and their geographical diversity, as well as on the enrolled students' capacity to follow efficiently the requirements of their study programme. Experts are therefore expected to check carefully the practical measures taken by those consortia that propose more than one tuition language, in order to:
 - guarantee the attractiveness of their joint programme (in number as well as in diversity of candidate students),
 - ensure that selected students have the required linguistic competences and
 - provide enrolled students with the necessary linguistic support if needed.

☞ **The tuition language(s) information should be compared with the information provided under point A.4.4 of the award criteria**

- **EMMC Participation Costs per semester:** The EMMC participation costs must be defined for the joint programme as a whole in accordance with the needs and means of each of its partners. They must include all mandatory costs related to the students' participation in the EMMC (including the mandatory insurance coverage). The amounts to be provided must correspond to the participation costs **per semester (i.e. for 30 ECTS) and in euro** charged to candidate students, **irrespective of whether or not they receive an Erasmus Mundus scholarship**. Although there can be different participation costs for European and third-country partners, the exact amount of participation costs requested from candidate students should be clear, transparent and meaningful for European and third-country applicants.

☛ **The amount of participation costs indicated in this section should be compared with the explanations provided under point A.2.5 of the award criteria**

- **Number of students planned to be enrolled per edition:** If selected, the EMMC will be offered individual scholarships for five consecutive editions of the joint programme. The number of scholarships will vary from one year to another from 10 to 4 for category A and from 8 to 3 for Category B⁹. The estimated number of students planned to be enrolled on a yearly basis, must be taken into account when assessing the consortium sustainability potential and its development plan.

C.2 Thematic fields: Applicants could select up to three different disciplines and include in a free text area any other relevant specialized (or multidisciplinary) area. Although there were no restrictions as to the broadness or narrowness of the thematic field, large multidisciplinary areas should nevertheless constitute a meaningful and coherent programme and not only an addition of themes and disciplines put together for the mere sake of attracting more candidates.

C.3 Summary description of the project: The quality (clarity, coherence) of the summary is usually a very good indicator of the proposal's general quality. If the summary does not provide a good and clear picture of the EMMC objectives and structure, it is to be expected that the detailed description of it will be of a similar quality. Inconsistencies between the summary and the detailed description should also be noted down and assessed under the relevant award criteria.

1.B.d Section D.

Under this section experts will have to pay attention to the relevance of the projects/activities listed as well as to the relevant expertise of the key staff involved in the implementation of the EMMC, from an academic, research and/or administrative point of view. There should be at least one person identified per consortium member (applicant plus partners) with a **maximum of three**.

☛ **Information to be used in the assessment of point A.1.5 of the award criteria**

1.B.e Section E.

Under this section, the degree-awarding institutions will have to specify the type of degree(s) intended to be awarded to successful students as well as the official name of each of the degrees.

First, applicants will have to select one or more of the three options provided to identify the type of degree(s) that will be delivered to successful students or doctoral candidates (i.e. double degree, multiple degree or joint degree). Depending on the mobility track and the degree(s) awarded by the corresponding institutions, it is possible that, within the same cohort, some graduates will receive a joint degree, while others will receive a double or a multiple degree, or even a joint degree accompanied by one or more national degrees.

In a second step, each of the degrees intended to be delivered by the consortium members will have to be presented. The information to be provided concerns:

- the official name of the degree in the language of the degree awarding organization;
- its translation in English, if available;
- the function of the degree signatory;

⁹ The number of scholarships allocated annually varies with the “seniority” of the EMMC with a slow but constant diminution for the oldest consortia as from their 4th edition. A new consortium will receive approximately 17 scholarships in total each year during its first four years of implementation.

- its type, i.e. if it will be delivered as a "stand-alone" national degree or as part of a joint degree;
- its recognition status at the time of the application (i.e. already recognized or not) and
- (depending on the answer provided before), the expected date for its official recognition or its validity end date.

The validity of the degree(s) intended to be awarded will be cross-checked with the Erasmus Mundus National Structures (and where applicable also with the EU delegations) of the countries concerned. In case of doubts, partner organizations are supposed to contact their EM National Structure in order to obtain prior confirmation of the validity of the degree they intend to deliver to successful students.

The function/position of the degree signatory: EMMCs should lead to the award of (a) formal degree document(s) which layout, content, visas and signature(s) are in line with the national legislation and regulations concerned. Therefore degree awarding institutions are expected to indicate in section E which of their authorities will sign the formal degree document awarded (e.g. rector).

Experts should note that

- **not all partner organisations need to be “degree awarding institutions”.** However, at least a number of HEI equivalent to minimum consortium size (i.e. 3 European HEIs) should act as degree awarding institutions. Even if it is not yet the case at application stage, it is expected that all European full partners become degree awarding institutions at medium term and this strategy should be reflected in the proposal
- In accordance with the Programme Decision, **joint programmes should be promoted.** If the EMMC consortium is not proposing a joint programme, it should explain why and/or confirm its intention to deliver joint degrees before the end of the funding period.

In order to facilitate the verification process by EM National Structures, and for already accredited degrees, **each European degree awarding institution** (i.e. applicant and full partners) **must provide in annex to the application package proof of recognition of the proposed degree(s).** When already accredited/recognised, the consortium must provide the proof of recognition to the relevant EM National Structures in accordance with the national requirements in place. Applicants have also been advised to annex a copy/model of the proposed degree. When the recognition/accreditation process is not yet completed, the consortium has to demonstrate either that this process has already been launched or that it will be completed in time and prior to the enrolment of the first Erasmus Mundus students in the joint programme. Experts can consult Annex 1 that includes information provided by EM National Structures on degree recognition in their own country.

☞ **Comments on the relevance, exactness, coherence of the information provided under Section E should be provided in the assessment of question A.2.2**

1.C The EMMC Award criteria

The information below provides guidance on the assessment of answers provided under each of the five EMMC award criteria. Applicants have been asked to provide full but concise information on each point, including the text in italics.

A.1 Academic quality - Course content (30 % of the max. score)

Under this award criterion applicants have to present the objectives of their EMMC proposal from an academic point of view and its possible contribution to the excellence, innovation and competitiveness of the European Higher Education sector.

A.1.1 Describe the EMMC **objectives** (including in socio-economic terms) in relation to the **needs analysis** in the field(s) concerned.

To what extent is the EMMC offer justified (notably in terms of inter/multi-disciplinary or newly emerging fields), and how is it linked to identified needs in a European and worldwide context?

A.1.2 Explain the EMMC's **added value** compared with existing masters courses in the same field at national, European and international level.

To what extent will this added value contribute to European university excellence, innovation and competitiveness, and, if applicable, to the cooperation expectations of the non European partner countries?

- The answers to these questions should provide clear, concrete, exemplified justifications of the proposal from both the academic/content and integration/structure points of view (i.e. the needs analysis and added value should address the thematic field – state of the art, innovation potential, Europe position as compared to other parts of the world, etc. – but also the structure of joint programme as such – existence/lack of other similar offers in the field, concrete added value of a joint approach as opposed to national initiatives, etc.).
- While reading these answers experts should not be taken in by the use of “buzz words” if there is no concrete evidence to back them up.
- The joint programme’s objectives should be assessed in comparison with the concrete measures proposed in the rest of the proposal in order to judge their coherence with the actions envisaged (e.g. if reference is made to the socio-economic impact, does the proposal include the relevant actors, does it propose concrete measures to involve them in the implementation and/or evaluation of the programme, etc.?)

A.1.3 Present the **structure and content** of the EMMC and justify the added value and relevance of the **mandatory mobility** component.

What will be the course structure and main teaching topics? To what extent do the course topics/structure/modules justify their relevance in relation with the course objectives and the needs of the field(s)?

How is the students' mobility relevant and instrumental to the course's purposes? If applicable, explain how the internship / placement / fieldwork activities fit in the joint course model and objectives.

- The structure of the joint programme should be clear, understandable and meaningful/justified in accordance with its learning objectives.
- The different mobility tracks proposed should be clearly justified and bring a concrete added value to the course content.
- The internship, placement or fieldwork possibilities should be assessed in relation with the participation of associated members in the joint programme.

A.1.4 Justify the **learning outcomes** relevance in view of the students' **future academic opportunities** (e.g. at doctorate level) and **employability**.

- The relevance of the learning outcomes should be assessed in relation with the needs analysis.
- The capacity to deliver these learning outcomes should be assessed in accordance with the proposed content of the joint programme and the consortium expertise.

A.1.5 Justify the relevance of **the consortium composition** and the expertise of the key **academic staff** involved to achieve the EMMC objectives.

What are the different fields of expertise of individual partners, and how are these complementary and of added value in the context of a joint and international masters programme? If applicable, what is the rationale and added value of having third-country partners in the consortium?

What is the profile of key actors (administrative and academic staff) in the EMMC implementation

(provide short and targeted information)? How will **invited scholars** contribute to the course?

- The information provided under this item of the award criteria must be crosschecked and assessed in comparison with the description of the partners' role and expertise provided under sections B.2, B.3, D1 and D.2 of the application form.
- In accordance with the Programme Guide, invited scholars should bring concrete added value to the course and students (through teaching of specific classes, leading and participating in seminars or workshops, monitoring and tutoring student research/project activities, participating in thesis reviews, preparing new teaching modules, etc.). Applicants should explain their strategy to identify and invite these scholars.

A.1.6 Explain the EMMC **interaction with the professional socio-economic/scientific/cultural sectors** concerned.

What types of interactions exist between the EMMC and non-educational actors of the sector concerned (including if applicable, the consortium's associated partners)? What type of involvement, if any, do these actors have in the course implementation (course evaluation, internship/placement providers, financial sponsors, research providers, employment perspectives, etc.)? What is their degree of commitment to the course?

- Consortia without concrete links with non-educational organisations (acting as associated members) will have difficulties in achieving a high score under this criterion; a “fair” score should be given if the involvement of this sector is only based on intentions and promises; if concrete actions (/substantiated elements) are provided the score could be increased up to “good”;
- Consortia involving this type of actors should clearly demonstrate that they are playing an active role in different aspects of the EMMC.
- The inclusion of specific agreements (/endorsement documents) with these organisations should be assessed positively.
- If applicable, check section B.2 for the profile and role of these non-educational organisations.

A.2 Course integration (25% of the max. score)

The Course Integration criterion focuses on issues related to the way the EMMC will be implemented in and across the partner institutions as concerns the delivery of the course itself as well as the students' selection, admission, examination and results recognition mechanisms.

A.2.1 Justify the extent to which the EMMC is organised **in a truly integrated way**.

To what extent is the course based on a jointly developed curriculum or composed of modules developed and delivered separately but complementarily? What is the level of participation and institutional commitment of individual partners to the course?

- The level of "jointness" / integration of the EMMC is one of the most important elements in the assessment of the proposal
- From an academic point of view, this integration must be demonstrated in the coherence of the joint programme and its different courses, modules, or mobility/specialisation tracks.
- The academic contribution of individual partners should be balanced.

A.2.2 Justify the extent to which the EMMC is **recognised in participating countries** and leads to the award of an **official degree** by each of the partner institutions. Describe the type of degree(s) that will be awarded to successful students.

How is the course integrated within the partners' courses/degrees catalogues? What is its recognition status in each of the partner institutions? If applicable, describe the ongoing recognition/accreditation process in the relevant countries and the actions taken to award a joint degree on behalf of the consortium partners. If available, provide a copy of the proposed degree(s).

- Experts should be familiar with the concept of joint, double or multiple degrees (see footnote 34 of the Programme Guide)
- Although it is not mandatory for all partner HEIs in the joint programme to be degree awarding institutions, non-degree-awarding HEIs should be the exception (at least for what concerns the European partners) and the consortium should explain its strategy and timetable planned in order to make these HEIs degree-awarding institutions.
- Experts should be reminded that the EM programme "promotes" joint degrees. If the proposal is based on double or multiple degrees, the consortium should explain its strategy to move towards a joint degree approach before the end of the five-year funding cycle. In this respect, experts should note that a certificate issued on behalf of all the partners but with no legal value in any of the countries concerned cannot be considered as a joint degree (it could be assessed positively though if it constitutes a complement to double or multiple national degrees and a first step toward the future award of a joint degree)

A.2.3 Describe the consortium joint student application, selection and admission procedure.

What common mechanisms, approaches, criteria will be used? How will the related tasks be shared? How will the procedure in place guarantee the recruitment of the best candidates through a transparent, fair and objective procedure? How will the equity issues (including balanced gender participation, students with special needs) be addressed?

A.2.4 Describe the joint examination methods and mechanisms in place between the consortium partners to assess the students' achievements.

*How will the ECTS (including the "grading scale") or other built-in mechanisms be used for the recognition of study and performance assessment? Will there be a (Joint) **Diploma Supplement** issued on behalf of the consortium (if available provide a model)? What will be the common requirements and methods developed by the consortium for the examination of students and the organisation of the thesis work (if applicable)?*

- These aspects of the joint programme's integration are vital for the coherence and joint identity of the programme. Application, selection, admission and examination mechanisms have to be common to the consortium as a whole and transparent to applicant and enrolled students.
- Application and selection criteria have to be clear, objective and transparent (/easily available to candidate students).
- Although the examination methods may vary from one partner institution to another, there must be clear, agreed and transparent conversion mechanisms, guaranteeing a fair treatment of all students independently from their host university.
- Participation of an external actors (from the research, education and/or economic sectors) in the final evaluation of the students should be considered as good practice and assessed positively.
- The delivery of a "Joint Diploma Supplement" issued by the consortium as a whole should be considered as a positive element in the integration of the joint programme.
- Regarding candidates with the "gender balance" and "special needs" issues, the assessment should be "neutral" (i.e. scored "3") for mere reference to measures and facilities in the participating organisations. Negative scores should be given if the issues are not addressed at all. Positive scoring can be given if the description of the approaches / measures proposed go beyond the simple reference and/or are specific to the EMMC concerned

A.2.5 Explain how the **students' participation costs** to the EMMC have been calculated and agreed upon by the consortium.

Taking into account the needs and means of each individual partner, provide a detailed description of the fees and other costs that justify the amount of participation costs that will be requested from the students for their enrollment in the masters course. If applicable, explain how the portion in excess of the EM maximum contribution to participation costs will be financed.

- Experts should assess the way the participation costs have been calculated in accordance with the institutions needs and means.
- They should judge to what extent these participation costs are realistic and justified (compared to the existing training offers and the consortium's one).
- Although there can be different fees for European and third-country students, consortia should explain the reasons for these differences (if any).
- In an EM integrated joint programme, the amount of participation costs should not vary depending on the mobility track followed by each individual student. At the end of their EMMC studies all successful students will be awarded the same qualification and, as a result, the financial contribution required from them for obtaining this qualification should be identical for all, irrespective of the universities/countries visited during their EMMC studies. Although it is not recommended, it is possible that legal constraints may require some consortia to put fee waiver mechanisms in place in accordance with the mobility tracks followed by the student.
- EMMC consortia are free to establish their level of participation costs in accordance with their particular needs. The EM scholarship will cover these costs up to a maximum of € 4000 per semester for Category A scholarships and € 2000 per semester for Category B scholarships. Although EMMC consortia can propose higher amounts for their participation costs, they should find other funding sources than the individual grant holders (own sources or other sponsors) to cover the difference between these amounts and the maximum contribution included in the scholarships.

A.3 Course management, visibility and sustainability measures (20 % of the max. score)

This criterion focuses on the way the consortium intends to manage the EMMC in order to ensure its efficient and effective implementation.

A.3.1 Describe the organisation of **the cooperation mechanisms within the consortium**.

What is the role of each of the partners in the EMMC implementation tasks (financial, evaluation, student support, promotion/marketing, etc.)? Describe the level (/quality) of human (/logistic) resources that will be dedicated by each of the partners to the EMMC implementation? What type of governing body(/ies) will be put in place? How are these roles defined and endorsed in an EMMC Consortium agreement (if available, attach a model as an annex)? To what extent are the students involved in the course coordination and implementation tasks? What type of management tools / methods are in place to ensure the appropriate implementation of the course (work programme, roadmap, milestones, work packages, etc.)

- Under these questions, experts should assess the degree of institutional commitment given to the EMMC by the partner institutions as well as the quality and solidity of the management and monitoring measures envisaged to ensure the efficient functioning of the joint programme.
- The level of completion (/detailed description) of the (future) Consortium agreement must be taken into account in the assessment of this criterion.

- The participation of different actors in the EMMC management bodies (students, associated partners, professionals from the field, etc.) should be considered as good practice.
- Experts are invited to read carefully the endorsement letters as well as the information provided under section B.2 and D.2 of the application form in order to assess the degree of institutional commitment given by the partners to the proposal.

A.3.2 Provide information on the **partner institutions' financial contribution** to the EMMC and describe the way the EMMC will be managed from a **financial** point of view.

In complement to criteria A.2.5, provide comprehensive information on the overall estimated implementation costs of the course and partners' complementary funding (e.g. contribution from partner institutions' own resources to finance additional scholarships, contribution from non educational organisations, etc.).

Explain how the EMMC financial resources will be managed by the consortium, and how will the grant (more particularly the consortium lump sum and the students' contribution to the participation costs) be used and distributed among the partners.

- The grant proposed under the Action 1 strand of the EM programme must be viewed in "co-funding" context. This means that beneficiary organisations are expected to contribute concretely (/financially) to the implementation of the EMMC.
- Any concrete (/evidenced) initiative taken by the consortium (including its associated partners) to secure additional funding for the joint programme and – more importantly – for the participation of additional students should be encouraged and assessed positively.
- Experts should judge the soundness in financial management of the grant (lump sum and scholarships) within the consortium. (to be completed to be better in line with the reformulation of the sub-criteria?)

A.3.3 Describe the consortium **development and sustainability plan** designed to ensure the proper implementation and continuity of the EMMC beyond the period of Community funding.

What strategies have been envisaged, over which period? What are the enrolment projections and the mid/long-term benefits for the partners? If applicable, are associated members involved in this sustainability plan and what degree of commitment can they provide?

- Although selected EMMCs will be funded for five consecutive editions of the joint programme (and another five if they are renewed), the number of scholarships offered by the programme will be gradually reduced as from the 5th year of funding.

A.3.4 Describe the **course promotion measures** taken by the consortium to increase the course's (and the EM programme's) visibility and attractiveness.

What type of promotion / visibility mechanisms will be implemented (e.g. via professional/academic associations, media, newsletters, conferences, fairs, etc.). How will the EMMC's dedicated website be promoted?

- Experts should base their assessment on the variety and detailed description of the information and promotion channels proposed (institutional/national/professional websites, newsletters, or associations, conferences/fairs/exhibitions, etc.).
- The existence (/future development) of an EMMC website covering the joint programme's main features (including its student application and selection procedure) constitutes a key element in the assessment of the EMMC visibility and promotion strategy.

A.4 Students' services and facilities (15% of the max. score)

Particular attention is paid under this criterion to the services and facilities offered to enrolled students as well as to the way applicant consortia intend to ensure efficient participation of these students in the EMMC activities.

A.4.1 Describe the nature of the **information (/support) provided to students** prior to their enrolment and the way this information will be delivered.

What type of information will be provided to students about the consortium (partners profile and expertise), the course (content, structure, delivery methods, learning outcomes and final degree(s) awarded), the student selection procedure and criteria, the services offered, etc? Which facilities will the EMMC's dedicated website provide (e.g. online application)?

A.4.2 Describe the content (and, if available, provide a model) of the **Student Agreement** defining the rights and obligations of the two signing parties.

What are the joint course implementation rules and mechanisms, mutual rights, obligations and responsibilities of the two parties as concerns the academic, administrative and financial aspects of the student's participation in the EMMC?

A.4.3 Present the **services** that will be provided by the partner institutions to **host students / scholars**, including the nature and coverage of the mandatory insurance scheme.

Which services will be offered by the "international office" or contact desk in terms of support for accommodation and financial facilities, coaching, assistance with visas and administrative formalities especially for third-country students/scholars? To what extent will specific services be available for students with a family or with special needs? How will this insurance scheme meet the EM Programme minimum requirements? How will it be managed (/funded) by the partners?

- As hosting institutions for European and non European students (and scholars), EMMC must guarantee a high level of support and assistance to these participants.
- Consortia should explain the level of information and assistance they will provide to candidate and selected students/scholars in order to address all issues they will be concerned with when joining the EMMC (from the academic as well as from the administrative, financial, legal, socio-cultural, etc. points of view).
- For both scholars and students, the EMMC consortia are obliged to design detailed agreements that cover precisely the rights and obligations from both parties (the consortium and the individual student/scholars) during the involvement of the individual in the course. Experts should assess the level of development and coverage of these agreements.
- EMMC consortia are obliged to put in place an insurance scheme for the EM scholarship holders, which fulfils the minimal requirements defined by the Agency for this purpose. (http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2010/documents/minimuminsurance_en.pdf)
- Experts should assess the degree of preparation of the consortium in this respect and, if applicable, its intention to go beyond the minimal requirements (by guaranteeing for instance the same coverage to non-scholarship holders).

A.4.4 Describe the consortium **language policy**.

How do the partner institutions intend to equip students with the necessary language skills to ensure that they will get the full benefit from participating in the EMMC course (e.g. training facilities, mentorship, local language learning, etc.)? How does this policy fit into the course itself (e.g. integration, availability, costs coverage, recognition of the language courses in the EMMC)? How does the consortium intend to meet the objective to offer students the possibility to use at least two different European languages?

- Independently of their language of tuition, EMMC consortia are obliged to provide their students with the possibility to learn/use at least two different European (EU) languages.
- Experts should assess the level of attention paid to this element and the commitment given by the consortium to offer such linguistic training (will it be offered for free, will it be recognised through ECTS credits valid for the final degree, etc.)
- For EMMCs using more than one tuition language, experts should check how the consortium intends to ensure (/improve) the necessary competence of the students in these different languages.

A.4.5 Indicate the measures taken to facilitate **networking** among the Erasmus Mundus students and between these students and other students from the partner institutions.

What activities/facilities are foreseen to ensure the socio-cultural integration of the EM students? What type of relations will the course foresee with the EM Alumni Association? If applicable, how often will the EM students (from the same or different cohorts) meet and exchange? What facilities are offered in this perspective? What is foreseen to ensure the proper academic induction of third country students?

- EM students should not be isolated, either from each other (if the EMMC structure foresees different mobility tracks from the start, it should also include moments/event when all enrolled students – from the same or from consecutive cohorts – meet) or from the local students.
- Experts should assess the measures proposed by the consortia to facilitate the interaction between Erasmus Mundus students and with local students. Proposals to create local (/EMMC specific) alumni associations – in relation to the overall Erasmus Mundus Student and Alumni Association (EMA) – should be assessed positively

A.5 Quality assurance and evaluation (10 % of the max. score)

Under this criterion applicant EMMCs will have to describe the quality assurance and evaluation strategy envisaged by the consortium in order to ensure efficient monitoring of the course (from both the content and administrative points of view) and its regular improvement during the five years of implementation.

A.5.1 Describe the **internal evaluation** strategy and mechanisms in place.

How (and with what periodicity) will this evaluation be organised (by the institutions themselves, through an integrated approach agreed by all partner institutions, with questionnaires and feedback systems, etc.)? How will the assessment outcomes be used to monitor, upgrade and improve the quality of the course? How will the actors (students / professors) be involved in this exercise?

A.5.2 Describe the **external quality assurance** envisaged.

What will the roles of the national, international or professional quality assurance bodies be, if any? Will external experts be recruited for this purpose and - if yes - on what basis and how often? What methodology will be followed? If applicable, will associated members be involved in this exercise?

- Although all (European) HEIs have quality assurance services and mechanisms in place, EMMC consortia should have their own mechanisms and procedures that guarantee the coherence of the qualitative evaluation among all participating universities and for all aspects of the joint

programme (not only the content but also the management, promotion, students' monitoring and support, etc.).

- The involvement of all actors concerned (students, scholars, administrative services) should be foreseen as well as the participation of "external evaluators" (from other HEIs with experience of participation in other EMMCs , or from the socio-economic environment concerned).
- Experts should look for concrete evidence of the involvement of external evaluators (incl. the identification of their origin, the regularity and methodology to the Quality Assessment review, etc.).

2. Good practices in the implementation of EMMCS

The examples/actions provided below are based on the findings of a recent Erasmus Mundus courses quality assessment exercise that was coordinated by the DG EAC and in which the Agency participated (! These examples do not by any means replace the wording and content of the award criteria, and only provide information on good practices as identified in the course of EM implementation so far). The quality assessment exercise concentrated on the identification of good practices within a sample of Erasmus Mundus courses with the aim of creating tools and guidelines that can assist the courses to reach higher standards of quality also assist potential applicants to prepare a high quality application.

A. Facilities, Logistics and Finance

1. When Students Apply to the Course

Why should students from third countries apply for an Erasmus Mundus Course in Europe? What can courses do to persuade them and to support their applications in the face of international competition for excellent students?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Start the applications process early to capture the attention of the best students
- ✓ Make good quality documentation available in formats suited to the students
- ✓ Communicate the selection criteria clearly
- ✓ Use international partners as 'local' points of contact for students, both to support students and to refine the selection process
- ✓ Provide interactive support to applicants during the application and recruitment process
- ✓ Communicate decisions on applications in a clear and timely manner
- ✓ Maintain an accessible and updated Web site that effectively communicates the Course information to students around the World, regardless of the bandwidth of their Internet connection

2. When Third Country Students Travel to Europe

What should be done in helping third country students to obtain visas quickly and effectively, to plan travel and accommodation and to be advised of local culture at their destination, so that they arrive at the University ready to study?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that the travel (mobility) support process starts as soon as a student is recruited
- ✓ Use the knowledge gained from Alumni and from the of former students to provide advice services for students
- ✓ Provide students with individualised integrated support for travel, accommodation and for living and working in a new cultural environment
- ✓ Ensure that students are provided with advice and support for their families, providing them with effective mechanisms to communicate with families in their home countries, and directing them to the necessary facilities and support services if their families are travelling with them to Europe
- ✓ Provide detailed assistance with visa handling
- ✓ Ensure that suitable accommodation is available to students
- ✓ Build support structures to facilitate cultural adjustment

3. Introducing Students to European Academic Practice

How can a diverse community of third country students be provided with an induction programme that trains them into the academic practices of a European University?

Possible actions:

- ✓ Provide a clear induction process through briefings and through documentation that is readily available to students before arrival
- ✓ Ensure that the induction process has clear mechanisms in place to capture the views of and learn from students
- ✓ Make the induction process culturally sensitive enough to deal with the social and cultural needs of the students
- ✓ Ensure that the induction process prepares the diverse students for the learning environment
- ✓ Provide opportunities for intercultural learning so that students and staff enrich their learning and teaching skills by experiencing academic practices from other countries
- ✓ Implement student agreements that state clearly the rights and the obligations of students and staff when participating in the Course

4. When Students Move Between Partner Institutions

How can students move from one institution to another, so that they assimilate rapidly to the new local environment and experience a seamless transition in their learning?

Possible actions:

- ✓ Assist students coherently in making the necessary transitions from institution to institution, from the provision of accommodation to ensuring the sufficient stability of the learning environment to support their learning
- ✓ Provide well-informed assistance with visa handling for students
- ✓ Provide students with good quality and timely information about the institutions they are to visit and the particular local issues that will affect them
- ✓ Ensure that the experiences of current and past students, on the inter-institutional movement process, have been recovered and embedded in the information provided to new students
- ✓ Avoid unnecessary student travel by ensuring that students who fail examinations at one institution are able to re-take the examination whilst at another institution

5. Student Support - Facilities and Finances

How can the Course ensure that the finance is allocated according to academic priorities, that students do not experience financial hardship, and help students to avoid confusion regarding local regulations? How can the Course provide students with consistent and coherent access to Library and other learning resources?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Allocate the finance transparently and efficiently across the institutions so that the money is linked to the delivery of the Course objectives
- ✓ During the recruitment and induction processes, inform and support students in areas of finance and financial management
- ✓ Provide interventions for, any particular issues such as insurances (health or others required by national legislation) and local residency regulations, that might be confronted by students
- ✓ Organise in advance the financial distribution mechanisms among partners
- ✓ Prepare the banking facilities/arrangements for the third-country students before arrival

- ✓ Ensure that the EU insurance scheme is comprehensive enough and if not, prepare for additional social security coverage
- ✓ Allowing students to maintain access to Library resources after they have moved to their next mobility location

6. Communicating and consulting with students

What processes and procedures are needed to ensure that there is consistent communication and consultation that is coherent across the consortium?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Implement efficient systems to support to learning and student-based Course evaluation
- ✓ Create opportunities for dialogue with students, and value the perception of students about the usefulness of information systems, with equal weight to that of teaching staff
- ✓ The information system in place is “fit for purpose” and regularly reviewed, it is timely, accurate and regularly updated
- ✓ Consult students regularly about the effectiveness of the support provided to them

7. Benefiting from Alumni

How can past students remain embedded in the development of the Course and how can their experience be recovered so that current students can benefit?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Put a system in place to build, and manage, a sustainable alumni association for graduates of the Courses
- ✓ Ensure that the alumni association in place is active and is “fit for purpose”. For example, providing facilities for career advice and dealing with "post-course" issues are in place as part of Course administration

8. E-learning strategy

To provide all students with a coherent and consistent access to all learning and teaching resources across the entire consortium, regardless of student mobility paths

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Plan for the online availability of teaching and learning resources across the consortium
- ✓ Plan to maximise the consistency of style for key learning resources such as lecture notes, bibliographies etc.
- ✓ Develop an online course resource of key online material (either documents, or well-maintained links to documents).

B. Quality of Leadership and Institutions

1. The highest quality academic staff

How can we recruit the best staff from across the consortium to teach on the Erasmus Mundus Course?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Secure the highest quality staff from the relevant disciplines across the institutions
- ✓ Build an Erasmus Mundus academic quality cluster with research as well as teaching and administration credentials

2. Creating a Strong Course "Brand"

How can the Course identity be created and marketed, so that excellent third country students work with excellent academics, in creating a definable educational brand that host institutions value strategically?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Make Erasmus Mundus a brand that attracts exceptional students, who are attracted by the prospect of studying at high quality institutions, with high quality staff, on a course with relevant and robust content
- ✓ Ensure that the host institutions see Erasmus Mundus as an opportunity to build their own academic quality by bringing in the brightest and best qualified students
- ✓ Maximise the utility of the course Web site in creating a strong course brand,
- ✓ Engage relevant professional bodies, and international associations in the constitution of a brand name for the course

3. Securing and maintaining Institutional Commitment

How can the Course ensure that there is institutional commitment for sustainability, and that this commitment is clearly articulated across the consortium?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that the Course has wide recognition at institutional level and is fully embedded into university structures
- ✓ Ensure that the Course fits within an institutional strategy that values its international reach and educational objectives
- ✓ There is long-term buy-in for Erasmus Mundus by the people who matter in the participating host institutions
- ✓ Identify senior players in key academic positions, who can take on a role as champions for Erasmus Mundus

4. International teaching and research

How can the course secure commitment from the Institutions to help them deliver the highest quality of learning and teaching to third country students?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Welcome students as important international members bringing with them an additional contribution to the life of the institutions
- ✓ Provide an appropriate institutional level commitment in place to ensure that Erasmus Mundus students can expect high standards of support

5. Course continuity and leadership succession

How can academic leadership be secured to take forward the development of the course and how staff turnover be mitigated across the consortium so that the continuity of the course is maintained?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Be sensitive to the opportunity costs experienced by those academics who commit significant time and energy to ensuring the success of the course
- ✓ Offer institutional recognition for the "teaching intensive" contribution of those academics who commit significant time to Erasmus Mundus
- ✓ Maintain a robust approach to ensuring the long run sustainability of the consortium that recognises the need for leadership and key staff changes over time
- ✓ Develop strategies to accommodate short-term leadership changes as well as more fundamental issues for leadership succession

6. Financial Sustainability

How can the future sustainability of the course be achieved?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Develop creative approaches to long-run finance, including considering the prospect of a cessation of Erasmus Mundus funding
- ✓ Use contacts such as Alumni, Local and Regional Organisations (Grants and Foundations), Business and Industry (Private Capital), to supplement the Erasmus Mundus finance that it receives
- ✓ Be specific about what actually is the sustainability goal after EU funding finishes

7. Organisational Knowledge-Building and internationalisation

How can each of the organisations individually, and corporately, benefit from the impact of being involved in Erasmus Mundus?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Monitor, discuss and analyse how Erasmus Mundus is benefitting stakeholders
- ✓ Understand how the impact of Erasmus Mundus can lead to a sustainable impact for the stakeholders.

C. Quality of Teaching and Learning

1. Designing an Excellent Curriculum

How can the curriculum be designed and constructed so that it forms an integrated programme? And, how can the Course progression, and Course materials, be designed consistently so that students experience continuity in their learning?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that all members of the consortium understand how other members of the consortium contribute to delivering a coherent course programme
- ✓ Schedule regular opportunities to critically and constructively identify where the coherence of the teaching programme could be improved

- ✓ Maintain a formal document which details to staff and students how the course is delivered across partner sites in a coherent manner - ensuring that the required competencies and skills are acquired across the mobility process
- ✓ Schedule a workshop to bring teachers together to discuss good practice and to plan the evolution of the curriculum
- ✓ Plan the sequencing of the modules and of learning support activities to be consistent with the design
- ✓ Show how the Course progression clearly underpins student progression to achieve the best learning outcomes
- ✓ Ensure that Course materials show that academic content is consistent with contemporary knowledge in the relevant disciplines
- ✓ Update reading lists and other core learning materials consistently across the course

2. Communicating Course Objectives and Outcomes

How can the Course objectives be defined in a way that achieves an integrated Course, yet respects the institutional priorities of each partner?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Set out and clearly document the objectives for the Course
- ✓ Communicate the Course objectives and expected outcomes to teachers and learners
- ✓ Align Teaching and learning activities are appropriately with course objectives and learning outcomes

3. Developing student competences

How can the course ensure that students ‘a priori’ are provided with comprehensive information about the skills and competencies that will prepare them effectively for their studies? What is needed to ensure that students develop all the competences they need to progress and succeed in their studies?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Develop a consortium-wide statement on core competencies and communicate this to students once they are accepted
- ✓ Provide links to resources that are accessible to students at their home location so that they can prepare themselves to start studies effectively
- ✓ If possible, develop a pre-entry resource pack that shows admitted students what level of knowledge (for example: sample of texts as a guide perhaps) and competencies (for example: active use of language and statistical mathematical level) are required.
- ✓ Agree a set of skills and competencies that are mandatory if the students are to succeed in their studies
- ✓ Provide opportunities for students to acquire and strengthen the key skills and competencies
- ✓ Identify where, in the structure of the Course and its mobility process, particular competencies are best inserted
- ✓ Undertake regular monitoring (tutorials etc.) of student progress in acquiring and strengthening the key skills and competencies
- ✓ Provide a system of feedback where consortium members can be informed of any issues arising about the availability of particular skills and competencies - allowing remedial action to be undertaken

4. Developing learning skills

How can the consortium work across the totality of the course to make sure that all the actors (students, academics, key support staff etc.) are in a position to work together without the risk of cultural misunderstanding, in accepting that students need to be helped in their transition from their "home" academic environment, to the diversity of the European academic environment?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Provide students with initial training in learning skills, including writing styles, plagiarism prevention, and presentation techniques to help in the transition to 'European' teaching and learning
- ✓ Provide students with a suitable range of bibliographic management tools to help them effectively structure their lecture material and readings

5. International learning and working

How will the students, and also all the staff across the Erasmus Mundus Course, be prepared to 'work together' effectively? How can students from other global learning cultures be prepared to learn and study according to the academic practices across the course consortium?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that all those at the 'front-line' (administrative, academic, library, support, laboratory technicians etc.) when dealing with students are provided with awareness training in 'working internationally'
- ✓ Clearly communicate the 'ways of teaching and learning' within a European university to students, and provide awareness and training opportunities to those who need help in the transition to 'European' teaching and learning
- ✓ Provide students with a written code of practice which they sign and agree to comply with
- ✓ Ensure that the code has clear mechanisms for the communication of ethical problems, with a confidential and transparent process being used to evaluate and resolve the problems
- ✓ Make the code responsive to the range of cultural and religious practices of third-country students
- ✓ Provide opportunities for 'front-line' staff across the consortium to exchange experience and advice about 'European' teaching and learning practices and the issues arising from international working

6. Developing linguistic competencies

How will students be prepared for the learning standards and practices they will experience at the European universities and what processes and facilities are available to them to cope with the languages spoken at each partner site? How are the academic and support staff prepared for teaching in English, or the local language of teaching?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that the consortium understands the overall language requirements that will be placed on students throughout their mobility and takes a collective view on how best to deal with any issues arising from site to site
- ✓ Understand the differences between language competencies needed for basic local social interaction, and those needed for the academic programme, and makes a distinction in the training that is offered
- ✓ Provide students with opportunities to learn languages prior to their arrival in Europe, and prior to their mobilities
- ✓ Ensure that there is awareness of the language competencies needed while students are on internships in companies where only the local language is spoken

7. Managing the teaching and learning environment

How can partners use the best available techniques and technologies to support and to enable the teaching and learning environment?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Provide students with an integrated teaching platform that operates seamlessly across all partner sites
- ✓ If an integrated system is not available, prepare students effectively prior to their mobility, so that they are familiar with the different teaching platforms as soon as they arrive at a partner location
- ✓ Provide students with learning tools, such as electronic bibliographic software, so that they manage reading and notes effectively and efficiently
- ✓ Share teaching and learning materials electronically across all participants in the consortium should be a standard element of any supporting technological platform for learning

8. Research activity and Research facilities

How can partners ensure that their research activities and research facilities are delivering the maximum learning value to students?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Provide students with opportunities to work directly with staff on current research projects
- ✓ Link dissertations effectively to current research priorities
- ✓ Ensure that internships and placements take place at locations which are putting research into practice
- ✓ Provide students with meaningful experience of state-of-the-art laboratory and research facilities in partner institutions

9. Consistent teaching practice

How can an active process be implemented across the consortium to identify and deal with issues arising from differences in the style, level and content of courses from partner to partner?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Embed staff mobility within the teaching process, such as staff teaching on courses at other partner sites, giving joint-seminars at other partner sites, or providing pre-mobility teaching preparation to students while at other partner sites
- ✓ Ensure that all partners are aware of the different teaching cultures and practices, and offer documented advice to students about the different practices that they will experience
- ✓ Take part in formal, or informal, 'peer-group' teaching assessment, by sitting-in on the teaching activities of partners and providing constructive feedback

10. Entrepreneurship and business skills

How can students be provided with the skills to develop businesses, to plan and develop a programme of research, and to manage intellectual property effectively?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Provide opportunities for students to develop business plans and research plans

- ✓ Provide learning opportunities related to information management and intellectual property law and practice

11. Internships contributing to student learning

How can internships and placements be a key attractor that motivates students to apply to the course, both enriching the learning experience of the students and to prepare them for real-world working environments?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Use a structured process for obtaining placements or internships
- ✓ Make the placement/internship system flexible and diverse so that the academic needs of the students are satisfied
- ✓ Create or structure the existing placement/internship vetting system
- ✓ Capture, structure, and learn from student feedback on placement/internship
- ✓ Ensure that the balance of placement options across participating institutions is fair and appropriate

12. Balancing workload and assessment

How can the workload for students (assignments, reading, attending classes etc.) be well-balanced across all partner sites, but still allow the students to 'experience' the particular qualities of the teaching and learning cultures at each site?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that the students accept that overall they experience consistent workload and assessment requirements no matter what their mobility is:
- ✓ Review the assessment loads and schedules for each partner site
- ✓ Provide students with a clear 'study diary' for their semesters where lectures, labs, and work submission deadlines are clearly identified
- ✓ Communicate clearly to students why there may be differences in workloads – for example particular specialisms at partner sites, different balances between classes and self-learning etc.
- ✓ Consult and listen to students (see the section under FLAF) and understand their experiences and concerns. Through constructive dialogue continue to work towards a balance of work for them.

13. Consistent Assessment Methods

How can the different academic practices at partner sites be resolved so that the students are provided with consistency in their workload across institutions and so that their work will be assessed consistently throughout their period of study?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Show how the assessment weightings given to Course elements are carefully adjusted to the balance of the overall curriculum
- ✓ Communicate the marking, assessment, and feedback criteria to students
- ✓ Show how the assessment criteria meet the objectives of ECTS
- ✓ Justify how assessment weightings take workloads and Course progression properly into account
- ✓ Document how the assessment weightings are designed to take account of the different backgrounds of the students
- ✓ Plan a review process for Course weightings to ensure continuous improvement of the Course
- ✓ Provide transparent information to students about assessment and examination loads, marking methods, and timetable

14. Formal Course Review

What arrangements need to be in place to ensure that the Course benefits from institutional review, independent external review, and from the experience of students and alumni?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Design the curriculum so that it is sufficiently flexible to allow for a reasonable degree of institutional difference in the participating universities
- ✓ Plan for inevitable variations in staff availabilities over time
- ✓ Plan flexibility in the curriculum and the staff structure to cope with the unexpected
- ✓ Implement a regular system of independent external review of assessment and quality control
- ✓ Ensure that students, past and present, are active stakeholders in the ongoing process of continuous quality improvement

D. Joined-up Practice and Integration

1. Selecting Students

How can the student selection process be undertaken in a way that involves all the consortium members, but also operates efficiently and effectively? Do the qualifications claimed by the student confirm that they have the right background education to match them to the Course and that their skill-set will prepare them well for the academic work they will undertake?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Involve all consortium members in the student selection process
- ✓ Take into account the different circumstances the students will encounter from host to host
- ✓ Make the selection process transparent so that students can quickly match themselves to a Course
- ✓ Use international research networks to develop innovative ways of verifying the qualifications of students
- ✓ Build institutional procedures for the accreditation for foreign education
- ✓ Focus strongly on competences and practical experience as a means of adding contextual richness to the statement of formal qualifications

2. Consortium Information System

How can we design and implement a course-wide information system that manages student information effectively and securely and that makes teaching and learning information accessible to all the students regardless of their location?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Use a secure Intranet facility with a robust content management system for the structuring and storing of student information
- ✓ Enter and store student information (from personal details to Course selection, assessment and examination marks) efficiently and securely
- ✓ Be transparent with students about the information that is stored on the system, with relevant assurances under freedom of information rules, that they can view and validate personal information
- ✓ Make available a teaching Intranet so that students can access teaching materials in an integrated manner, regardless of their geographical location

3. Policy for Course Fees

How can the finance from student fees be allocated across the consortium so that the money is invested according to academic objectives? How can the fee policy accommodate different national and institutional policies across the consortium?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Set Course fees through a formal consortium policy
- ✓ Allocate Course fees per student across the institution so that academic objectives are met
- ✓ Agree a formal pan-institutional policy regarding the distribution of Course fees to cover management overheads and academic activities

4. Division of Labour across the Consortium

How can all members of the consortium reach acceptance on the division of labour in a way that meets all the academic objectives?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Agree and document the process by which tasks within the division of labour are allocated and can be reviewed
- ✓ Document the division of labour between institutions, in the context of clear effectiveness and efficiency criteria

5. A Consortium-Wide Quality Assessment Process

How should staff internally review their course and how can structured student feedback on the Course be obtained in a way that clearly communicates the outcomes to those who contributed to the consultation process?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Use information provided by each partner institution to regularly review the quality of the Course content and the teaching of the Course
- ✓ Use the information to ensure that the Course modules are normally delivered by the best available teachers across the consortium
- ✓ Obtain feedback from students at all partner sites and review, harmonise and act upon the outcomes at the consortium level

6. Managing the Consortium

How can we implement performance expectation and performance management across the consortium, in a way that respects the authority of each Institution and each Department?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Ensure that individuals in the consortium have significant prior experience of working together, through formal collaborative structures, joint research and teaching
- ✓ Define criteria for the expected performance levels of members and clearly state expectations for potential new partners
- ✓ Agree a management hierarchy and a level of in-built trust that allows Programme Coordinators to have widely delegated operational responsibility

- ✓ Develop and implement a formal consortium agreement that records the agreed procedures and practices in the management of the Course
- ✓ Agree protocols for communication and conflict resolution as devices to build and sustain trust

7. Develop a clear policy for awarding the Master Degree

How can the national and institutional policies regarding Master degrees be resolved so that students are awarded an identifiable Erasmus Mundus Master degree?

Possible Actions:

- ✓ Set out clearly, in the consortium agreement, the ways in which the Erasmus Mundus Master Degree will be awarded
- ✓ Provide full transcripts of student achievement in a format that can be accepted by institutions back in their home countries

3. Recommendations for the assessment of EMJD proposals

The 2011 selection success rate should be of approximately 7% i.e. only 1 proposal out of 14 has a chance to be selected.

During their assessment, experts will have to ask themselves three key questions

1. Will this proposal actively contribute to the training of excellent young researchers and to the innovation process in the thematic field(s) concerned?
2. Will this proposal contribute to the shaping of a strong and sustainable “European Doctorate” model in line with the objectives of the Bologna Process and which follows the prescriptions included in the “Code of Good Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers” and the European Charter for Researchers”?
3. Does this proposal indeed demonstrate the capacity and the readiness to run if selected?

Endorsement letters

The inclusion of endorsement letters from all consortium partners, whilst not a mandatory requirement, is highly recommended in the Action 1 application process.

Experts are invited to consult these endorsement letters in order to assess the level of institutional commitment they present and compare them with the information provided in other sections of the application form (section B.2 in particular) and in the answers provided by the applicant to the relevant award criteria.

Endorsement letters are also highly recommended for those associated partners that play a structural (/ formal / longstanding) role in the joint programme (e.g. by providing financial support or hosting students regularly or contributing to the joint programme's evaluation).

Section B.2 and B.3

- Look for relevant information on the organisation's expertise in relation to the proposal, i.e. research expertise, international dimension, experience with (/existence of) double/multiple/joint degree schemes, doctoral school(s), links with industry/economic environment.
- The whole section should be read and assessed in conjunction with section D

Section C.1. for EMJDs

- Experts should pay special attention (**bearing in mind the requirements detailed in the Programme Guide**) to the data provided under this section since it will be used for statistical and financial simulation purposes and it seems some applicants have misunderstood the meaning of some of the questions:
 - The “EMJDs can last 3 or 4 years but the Erasmus Mundus fellowships are always awarded for period of 3 years or 36 months. If the EMJD is expected to last four years:
 - the 36-month fellowship can be used at any time during this period but the monthly allowance cannot be recalculated in order to cover 48 months;
 - the consortium will have to explain how the activities and costs incurred by the doctoral candidate during the year not covered by the fellowship will be taken care of.

As it is stated in the Programme Guide the period of 48 months is the max. duration of an EMJD. Nevertheless, in case a proposal has chosen the 36 months option experts should

check if possible within the proposal how the duration is calculated and what it includes e.g. Does the proposal include in the 36 months the final thesis defense and graduation of the candidate? If not, how does the consortium plan to cover financially the additional period i.e. that would possibly exceed the 36 months?

- For “**Laboratory-based**” or “**non-laboratory based**” EMJD the following should be checked:
 - Has it been properly filled in? An EMJD is considered to be “**laboratory-based**” if the research projects carried out by the candidate students require the usage of expensive equipment/materials, the execution of external fieldwork or involve particularly high costs that would (largely) exceed the € 300 /month included in the fellowship amount for “non-laboratory-based” research projects.
 - What is the justification provided under question B.3.4 of the award criteria regarding the option of laboratory or non-laboratory costs?
- As regards the data about **employment contracts and stipends** it will have to be carefully crosschecked with the answers given under criterion B.4.4. See also below more details under the relevant criterion
- The question on about link(s) of the proposed EMJD with **an existing EMMC and/or Marie Curie Network** is only for information and statistical purposes
- **Resubmission of a rejected proposal:** as mentioned under Section 3.4, proposals rejected under previous calls for proposals should provide the number of their previously rejected bid so as to allow the Agency and the experts comparing the progress made and ensuring the current and previous comments are coherent and do not contradict each other. Although the Agency will identify all the cases in which the applicant has provided the relevant information, **if an expert believes a proposal is a resubmission of a previously rejected one and if the relevant data has not been provided under section C.1, (s)he should inform the Agency for further investigation.**
- For the **number of “institutions visited”** and the “minimal length of the mobility period”, which is related to the EMJD mobility requirement, the minimal programme requirements are at least “2” of the European countries represented in the consortium and “six months” (see carefully section 5.2.2 of the Programme Guide). This minimal number of countries visited during the research activities must apply to all enrolled candidates. Anything in excess of this could be considered as positive as long as it is:
 - justified for (/instrumental to) the quality of the proposal,
 - coherent with what is described under B.3.2
- All selected EMJDs should include a **training component** in core and transversal skills directly related to the researcher's professional needs. EMJD consortia are free to decide in which language(s) these training modules will be delivered.
- The **number of EM fellowships** intended to be awarded for each edition (approx. 6 Category A fellowships and 4 Category B fellowships.) >>> since the EMJD should not depend solely on the programme's funding and should demonstrate its sustainability, a number (too) close to these figures is not a good sign in this respect.

Section C.2

- Applicants could select up to three different disciplines and include in a free text area any other relevant specialized (or multidisciplinary) area.

- The thematic area covered by the EMJD >>> while it will be hard to find a lot of doctoral candidates for a very specialized and narrow research subject, larger multidisciplinary proposals should reflect this diversity in the number of doctoral candidates they expect to attract.
- Although there were no restrictions as to the broadness or narrowness of the thematic field, large multidisciplinary areas should nevertheless constitute a meaningful and coherent programme and not only a compilation of themes and disciplines put together for the mere sake of attracting more candidates. If applicable, this lack of coherence and integration should be demonstrated under award criteria 1 and 3.

Section C.3

- The quality (clarity, coherence) of the summary is usually a very good indicator of the proposal's general quality. If the summary does not provide a good and clear picture of the EMJD objectives and structure, it is to be expected that the detailed description of it will be of a similar quality.
- Inconsistencies between the summary and the detailed description should also be noted down and assessed under the relevant award criteria.

Section D

- Under this section experts will have to pay attention to the relevance of the projects/activities listed as well as to the relevant expertise of the team leader involved in the implementation of the EMJD; any evaluation aspect related to this section should be included under the assessment of criterion B.2 (e.g. B.2.1, B.2.2) and also B.5.1.
- There should be at least one person identified per consortium member (applicant plus partners) with a **maximum of three**.

Section E

- Under this section the degree-awarding institutions will have to specify the type of degree(s) intended to be awarded to successful students or doctoral candidates as well as the official name of each of the degrees
- First, applicants will have to select one or more of the three options provided to identify the type of degree(s) that will be delivered to successful students or doctoral candidates (i.e. double degree, multiple degree or joint degree). Depending on the mobility track and the degree(s) awarded by the corresponding institutions, it is possible that, within the same cohort, some graduates will receive a joint degree, while others will receive a double or a multiple degree, or even a joint degree accompanied by one or more national degrees.
- In a second step, each of the degrees intended to be delivered by the consortium members will have to be presented. The information to be provided concerns:
 - the official name of the degree in the language of the degree awarding organization;
 - its translation in English, if available;
 - the function of the degree signatory;
 - its type, i.e. if it will be delivered as a "stand-alone" national degree or as part of a joint degree;
 - its recognition status at the time of the application (i.e. already recognized or not) and
 - (depending on the answer provided before), the expected date for its official recognition or its validity end date.

The validity of the degree(s) intended to be awarded will be cross-checked with the Erasmus Mundus National Structures (and where applicable also with the EU delegations) of the countries concerned. In case of doubts, partner organizations are supposed to contact their EM National Structure in order to obtain prior confirmation of the validity of the degree they intend to deliver to successful students or doctoral candidates.

The function/position of the degree signatory: EMJDs should lead to the award of (a) formal degree document(s) which layout, content, visas and signature(s) are in line with the national legislation and regulations concerned. Therefore degree awarding institutions are expected to indicate in section E which of their authorities will sign the formal degree document awarded (e.g. rector).

Experts should note that

- **not all partner organisations need to be “degree awarding institutions”.** However, at least a number of HEI equivalent to minimum consortium size (i.e. 3 European HEIs) should act as degree awarding institutions. Even if it is not yet the case at application stage, it is expected that all European full partners become degree awarding institutions at medium term and this strategy should be reflected in the proposal
- In accordance with the Programme Decision, **joint programmes should be promoted.** If the EMMC consortium is not proposing a joint programme, it should explain why and/or confirm its intention to deliver joint degrees before the end of the funding period.

In order to facilitate the verification process by EM National Structures, and for already accredited degrees, **each European degree awarding institution** (i.e. applicant and full partners) **must provide in annex to the application package proof of recognition of the proposed degree(s).** When already accredited/recognised, the consortium must provide the proof of recognition to the relevant EM National Structures in accordance with the national requirements in place. Applicants have also been advised to annex a copy/model of the proposed degree. When the recognition/accreditation process is not yet completed, the consortium has to demonstrate either that this process has already been launched or that it will be completed in time and prior to the enrolment of the first Erasmus Mundus students in the joint programme. Experts can consult Annex 1 that includes information provided by EM National Structures on degree recognition in their own country.

Award Criteria

B. 1 Academic and Research quality (25% of the max. score)

Under this award criterion applicants will have to present the objectives of their EMJD proposal from an academic and research point of view and its possible contribution to the excellence, innovation and competitiveness of the European Higher Education and Research areas.

| |
|---|
| <p>B.1.1 Describe the EMJD objectives (including in scientific and socio-economic terms) in relation with the needs analysis in the field(s) concerned;</p> <p><i>To what extent is the EMJD offer justified (notably in terms of inter/multi-disciplinary, intersectorial and/or newly emerging fields), and how is it linked to identified needs in a European and worldwide context?</i></p> |
| <p>B.1.2 Justify the joint programme's added value and distinctiveness compared with existing programmes at national, European and international level.</p> <p><i>To what extent will the joint programme contribute to the shaping of a European Doctorate model? How does it provide concrete added value to European education, research, excellence and competitiveness?</i></p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the answers to these questions should provide clear, concrete, exemplified justifications of the proposal from both the research/content and the integration/structure points of view (i.e. the needs analysis and added value should address the thematic field – state of the art, innovation potential, Europe's position as compared to other parts of the world, etc. – but also the training and research programme as such – existence/lack of other joint doctorates in the field, concrete |

| |
|---|
| <p>added value of a joint approach as opposed to national initiatives, contribution to the shaping of a European Doctorate model, etc.);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ experts should not be taken in by the use of “buzz words” if there is no concrete evidence to back these up; ○ objectives should be assessed in comparison with the concrete measures proposed in the rest of the application in order to judge their coherence with the actions envisaged (e.g. if reference is made to the socio-economic impact, does the proposal include the relevant actors, does it propose concrete measures to involve them in the implementation and/or evaluation of the programme?) |
|---|

| |
|--|
| <p>B.1.3 Present the education, training and research programme, including its originality, innovative aspects and scientific quality notably as regards research methodologies and approaches.</p> <p><i>How is the relevance between education / training activities and the research part articulated? What are the training activities in terms of core and transferable skills?</i></p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ under this question, applicants should provide concrete evidence of the appropriateness and novelty of their joint programme from a methodological and structural point of view. ○ The articulation between the different parts of the joint programme and, if applicable, the different type of organisations involved should be clearly justified ○ Only if the proposal indicates a link to a Marie-Curie network: Possible evidence of exploitation of existing experience from Marie – Curie activities and, if yes, how this experience is taken into account in the EMJD proposal |

| |
|--|
| <p>B.1.4 To what extent does the programme include inter-sectorial and inter-organisational collaboration? .</p> <p><i>How does this collaboration provide added value for the candidate during his/her EMJD activities and for his/her future professional career? How does it address societal and economical needs as well the issue of graduate employability?</i></p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ experts should look for concrete evidence, substantiated in other parts of the application and not vague promises; ○ links with different actors should clearly provide an added value to the candidate’s research and expected outcomes. |

| |
|--|
| <p>B.1.5 Describe the nature and quality of the expected outcomes from the innovative educational, scientific and technological point of view, including in terms of skills and competences acquired.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ answers to this question should be assessed in comparison with the EMJD objectives and the concrete activities / training offers contained in the proposal |

B.2 Partnership experience and composition (25% of the max. score)

This award criterion will be used to assess the adequacy of the partnership to the objectives of the programme and in particular the scientific excellence of the consortium partners as well as their education, research and innovation capacities.

B.2.1 Justify the relevance of **the consortium composition** and the expertise of the key **academic and research staff** involved to achieve the EMJD objectives.

Justify the expertise (in terms of capacity, expertise and experience) of individual partners (understood as both the institutions and the key academic, research and administrative staff); how are these of added value in the context of a joint and international doctorate programme? Present the key actors (administrative, research and academic staff) for the EMJD implementation (provide short and targeted information).

- experts should pay attention to the relevance of the expertise/experience described in relation to the proposal and with the dual objective of the Programme Action, i.e. answering the specific needs of the field(s) concerned AND contributing to the shaping of a sustainable European Doctorate model;
- unbalanced description of this expertise (mainly based on one – usually the coordinator - or only some of the partners) could reflect a lack of common/joint contribution in the preparation of the proposal; a crosscheck should also be done with the endorsement letters supplied with the proposal;
- attention should also be paid to the expertise of academic staff to supervise PhDs.

B.2.2 Describe the **complementarity** (in terms of education, training, research or dissemination/valorisation activities) of the consortium members and their **diversity** (in terms of countries / regions, types of organisation, etc.).

B.2.3 Present the partnership track records in terms of **networking and cooperation** activities (through their joint involvement in EU/international research and/or education projects).

Demonstrate the level of internationalisation in terms of concrete international experience and activities; if relevant, justify the added value of third-country organisations to the EMJD objectives and content.

- as for many other questions, this issue should be assessed in the global perspective of the proposal; in other words, “diversity” and “complementarity” of the consortium members should only be considered as a positive element if clearly justified and instrumental to the EMJD objectives and structure; this aspect is particularly relevant for the inclusion of non-European partners;
- partners “diversity” and “complementarity” should be looked at from different points of view, i.e. geographical, linguistic, facilities and equipment, research approaches/traditions, transversal skills expertise, links to specific socio-economic environment, etc.;
- while it is not necessary that all the consortium partners have contributed to (/participated in) the same projects in the past, the demonstrated existence of links between (groups of) partners can constitute a guarantee for the consortium solidity, credibility and sustainability;
- experts should look for concrete figures/data on the consortium experience in receiving international postgraduate students /doctoral candidates (in the field concerned), implementing international partnership agreements and/or joint postgraduate degrees, receiving invited international guest scholars, being recognised at international level (through conferences, seminars, publications, etc.);
- mere reference to the existence of international relations offices or the longstanding experience in ERASMUS mobility should not be considered sufficient for obtaining more than a “fair” score under this question

B.2.4 Justify the role and appropriateness of the **professional/non-academic (/economic/scientific/cultural) sector** participation in terms of **activities** and **responsibilities**.

How are associated partners involved? How is this involvement formalised in specific arrangements and agreements covering issues such as co-funding, co-supervision, intellectual property rights, publishing possibilities, quality assurance, etc?

- consortia with no non-educational organisations (as full partners or associated partners) will have difficulties in achieving a high score under this criteria; a “fair” score should be given if the involvement of this sector is only based on intentions and promises; if concrete actions (/substantiated elements) are provided the score could be increased up to “good”;
- consortia that involve this type of actors (as full partners or associated partners) should clearly demonstrate that they are playing an active role (and that have not been included for scoring higher in the selection process) in different aspects of the EMJD. In that regard information on the balance between basic and applied research should be clear;
- inclusion of specific agreements with these organisations, even more when they are referring to and providing details on the EMJD concerned, should be assessed positively.

B.3 European integration and functioning of the programme (20% of the max. score)

While criteria 1 and 2 address mainly the specific research part of the EMJD from the content and consortium composition points of view, the third and fourth award criteria address the coherence, solidity, integration of the proposal from the “European Joint Doctorate” perspective.

In order to assess this aspect of the proposals, experts should get familiar with the different studies and reports published during the last few years on “European Doctorates” as well as with the “*European Charter for Researchers* and the *Code of Good Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers*.”

Criterion 3 will focus on issues related to the way the EMJD will be implemented in and between the partner institutions as concerns the delivery of the doctoral programme itself.

B.3.1 Describe the extent to which the EMJD programme is organised in a **structured and integrated way**.

How does the EMJD programme plan to exploit current good practices in terms of doctoral/graduate/research schools or co-tutelle arrangements? What are the measures foreseen in order to provide a strong research environment capable of enhancing excellence and international collaboration? How does the programme ensure full recognition - through ECTS or other built-in mechanisms – for all the training and research activities performed by the candidates?

- Existence of “co-tutelle” agreements, concrete evidence of use of ECTS or other concrete, transparent and joint/common mechanisms for the recognition of the activities in the different consortium partner organisations should be considered as positive elements and reflected in the corresponding score.
- The proposal should demonstrate a clear structure and a global overview of the courses offered, i.e. not a list of courses offered at national level without any reference to an integrated structure.

B.3.2 Justify the relevance and appropriate organisation of the mandatory **mobility periods** of the candidates in the participating institutions.

Describe the structure of the EMJD for what concerns the relevance and appropriateness of the mandatory mobility component. In what way is the coherence with the overall content of the programme ensured?

- Under this question experts should look at all mobility aspects from content, organisational and “integration” points of view (i.e. is it well structured and integrated in the programme, does it fit into its global picture and coherence?).
- While it is mandatory to spend at least six months of the programme in another consortium organisation, longer periods in more than one other partner should be assessed positively as long as they are instrumental to the EMJD’s objectives and not artificially proposed for the sake of the selection process.

B.3.3 Describe the **common standards** and mechanisms developed by the consortium for the **application, selection, admission and review of doctoral candidates** (European and third-country).

What measures are proposed to ensure the recruitment of the best candidates? How does the consortium ensure that these mechanisms are transparent, fair and objective? What are the provisions to take into account the equity issues and gender balance? How does the consortium explore alternative ways of recruitment considering the Life Long Learning requirements?

- In the context of an EMJD, the doctoral candidates' application, examination and selection process, should be transparent, fair and objective, and should be jointly implemented by the consortium as a whole (or at least with the formal agreement of all the partners).
- Experts will have to assess the appropriateness of the procedure proposed and the degree of involvement (/commitment) given by the partners (or associated members) to this procedure.
- The way the consortium will identify, select and offer specific research topics to doctoral candidates should also be presented and assessed in the context of this criterion.
- Regarding equity issues it should be considered as “neutral”, i.e. scored “3” for a mere reference to “gender balance” approaches among the participating organisations. Negative scores should be given if the issue is not addressed at all. Positive scoring can be given if the description of the approaches proposed go beyond simple reference and/or are specific to the EMJD concerned.

B.3.4 Explain how the **participations costs** in the joint programme have been calculated; if differences exist between third-country and European candidates, what are the reasons for such differences?

Taking into account the needs and means of each individual partner, provide a detailed description of the estimated implementation costs of the joint programme and, out of these, the doctoral candidate participation costs (fees and other costs). How will these costs be distributed among the participating institutions? Additionally, provide a justification for having (or not) laboratory costs (e.g. What do these costs consist of?)

- Although the EM programme's contribution to the participation costs is a fixed amount that varies in accordance with the “laboratory” “non laboratory” classification of the candidate PhD project, applicants are expected to describe in detail the way this contribution will be used and the activities/costs it will contribute to support.
- Although as stated in the Programme Guide, EMJD consortia are free to define their level of participation costs, EM fellowship holders should not be charged more than the programme's contribution to these costs. Any concrete evidence demonstrating that the consortium will implement such partial fee waiver approach, should be assessed positively, and “vice versa”.
- Experts should assess the validity of the classification proposed by the consortium i.e. does the research field justify that the EMJD is mainly considered as a “laboratory” or non laboratory” based programme? How do the described costs support (or not) this justification? The description given within this question should be in line with the information under section C.1 of the application form.
- Contrary to the approach followed for the Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses, there is no difference in the amounts of fellowship proposed by the Programme to European or third-country candidates (the only exception being the travel allowance). As a result, any difference proposed by an applicant consortium should be clearly explained and justified (e.g. because national legislation imposes higher fees to non-European candidates).

B.3.5 Justify the appropriateness and the **quality of joint supervision and monitoring** of the candidate activities (including the exams for the taught part and the assessment and defence of the thesis) to ensure the highest quality of the outcomes.

To what extent do assessment committees include external representation chosen at international level and/or non-academic experts? To what extent do the assessment criteria include compulsory publication requirements and/or an evaluation of the potential contribution of the candidate's work to innovation?

- In the context of an EMJD where several organisations will be co-responsible for the quality of the training and research activities carried out by the candidate, concrete and formally agreed evaluation mechanisms should be put in place; this applies to the intermediary evaluation as well as to the PhD presentation.
- Applicants should provide concrete evidence on the way doctoral candidates will be supervised during their EMJD activities.
- Participation of an external examiner (from the research, education and/or economic sectors) should be considered as good practice and assessed positively.
- Proposed supervisors should have the necessary expertise; timing and form of supervision should be clearly described.
- Concrete corrective mechanisms should be proposed in order to quickly identify and, if applicable, solve performance problems from specific candidates.

B.3.6 What is the kind and nature of the **degree(s)** awarded and, if applicable, the measure taken or envisaged by the consortium to deliver a fully accredited and recognised **joint degree**;

How the joint programme is integrated within the partners' doctoral programmes catalogues? What is the recognition status in each of the partner institutions? If applicable, describe the ongoing recognition/accreditation process in the relevant countries and the actions taken to award a joint degree on behalf of the consortium partners. If available, provide a copy of the proposed degree(s)

- Experts should be familiar with the concept of joint, double or multiple degrees (see footnote 52 of the Programme Guide and also relevant information above under section E).
- While in accordance with the Programme's Decision, "joint degrees" should be promoted, experts need to pay particular attention to the concept (is it really a joint degree or a "cooperative" double degree) and the credibility of the joint degrees proposed by EMJD applicants; in this respect a certificate issued on behalf of all the partners but with no legal value in any of the countries concerned cannot be considered as a joint degree (it could be assessed positively though if it constitutes a complement to double or multiple national degrees and a first step toward the future award of a joint degree).
- Experts should crosscheck the coherence of the information provided with what is stated under section E of the application form (see also above relevant information). Particular attention should be paid to the validity of the degrees mentioned/proposed at national level.

B.4 Provisions for EMJD candidates and fellowship holders (15% of the max. score)

This criterion will address aspects such as the overall promotion and marketing strategy, the existence of arrangements for the administration of the fellowships, the recruitment conditions and the support to the candidates as regards linguistic aspects, career prospects and services.

B.4.1 Present the **information and promotion strategy** envisaged by the consortium to reach out potentially interested **candidates** in particular those from third-countries;

What type of promotion / visibility mechanisms will be implemented (e.g. via professional/academic associations, media, newsletters, conferences, fairs, etc.). How will the EMJD's dedicated website be promoted?

- Experts should base their assessment on the variety and detailed description of the information and promotion channels proposed (institutional/national/professional websites, professional/academic/research newsletters/publication/associations, conferences/fairs/exhibitions, etc.).
- Since one of the objectives of EM is to attract good non-European doctoral candidates, the extra promotion activities outside Europe should be particularly addressed.

B.4.2 Present the services that will be provided by the partner institutions to host doctoral candidates.

Which services will be offered (housing facilities, coaching, activities aimed at social integration, assistance with visas and social insurance, etc.)? To what extent are specific services available for doctoral candidates with a family or with special needs?

- Experts should not expect to find a lot of innovative approaches under this question since most of the applicants will refer to their traditional student support (especially when some of them had had experience in an EM Masters Course) and assistance services. Nevertheless, the information provided under this question should be detailed and refer to all partners involved in the consortium (e.g. not only focusing on the coordinating institution).
- If there is a third-country partner relevant information should also be available.
- In view of the worldwide dimension of the EMJDs, specific support dedicated to non-European candidates (for visa requirements among other things) should be assessed positively.
- Regarding candidates with a family or special needs it should be considered as “neutral”, i.e. scored “3” for mere reference to “special needs” approaches among the participating organisations. Negative scores should be given if the issue is not addressed at all. Positive scoring can be given if the description of the approaches proposed go beyond the simple reference and/or are specific to the EMJD concerned.

B.4.3 Describe the language policy of the consortium.

How does the consortium address the linguistic aspects of candidates' mobility (e.g. training facilities, mentorship, local language learning, etc.)? What are the arrangements in place regarding language courses in the joint programme (e.g. integration, availability, costs coverage, recognition of the language courses in the joint programme). How does the consortium intend to meet the objective to offer candidates the possibility to use at least two different European languages?

- The possibility for all doctoral candidates to use at least two different European languages during their EMJD is a requirement for all proposals.
- Experts will have to look at the way this requirement is fulfilled and assess the quality and relevance of the linguistic offer proposed (in terms of integration, accessibility, cost, etc.).

B.4.4 What administrative arrangements are foreseen for the award of the fellowships (including health care, social security and pension rights) and the distribution of the fellowship holders among the EMJD partners?

*What are the concrete actions and steps the consortium plans to take for the appointment of Doctoral candidates under **employment contracts** (including among other aspects the use of single or multiple contracts, provisions of research posts, issuing of work permits etc)? What are the measures taken to deliver the **fellowship scheme** (distribution of grantees among institutions, the financial management of fellowships and consortium lump sum)?*

- The recruitment of doctoral candidates under employment contracts is a mandatory component of the Marie Curie Initial training networks. Following also the Erasmus Mundus Programme Guide employment contracts should be the rule and stipends the exception, acceptable only if duly justified in the application i.e. national regulations, related to both EU and/or third-country candidates, that would prohibit the consortium from using employment contracts; given that this kind of problem maybe the case for only one or some of the partners of the consortium the

various possibilities and combinations presented in the proposal should be assessed carefully for their feasibility and reasoning. Reference should be made to section 2 "Definitions and Glossary" of the Programme Guide where a definition of the employment contracts is given.

- It is possible to have one single contract (candidate is employed by one partner institution and in the context of this contract he/she performs his/her mobility to the other partners) or multiple contracts (candidate is employed by more than one partner according to his/her mobility scheme). Whatever the approach is planned to be, the consortium has to ensure that the EM financial and eligibility requirements are respected, that the planned contracts are in line with the national legislation concerned and that the candidate is not penalised in any way or form.
- In view of the programme's maximum contribution to the candidate's living allowance and the researcher's salary levels imposed in some European countries, part-time employment contracts are acceptable as long as they guarantee appropriate living conditions for the candidates and that they do not lead to an extension of the duration of the EMJD.
- If stipends are proposed (and duly justified!), experts should ensure that health and accident insurance is provided to the candidate as part of the participation costs and not subject to an additional fee; as mentioned above the possibility of the stipends may arise only for one of the partners or for more of them depending on the reasoning about not using employment contracts.
- Given that the EM fellowship scheme/EM funding is available for 3 years the proposal should state the foreseen financial arrangements to cover a fourth year or any period exceeding the three years funding, where applicable.
- The € 2800 per month for employment contracts is considered as a gross amount and should cover the full cost for the employer. The remaining net amount should be equivalent to the stipend amount (1400 EUR, see Programme Guide, section 5.4, page 45) . In other words, if the remaining amount is lower than 1400 EUR there should be a justification/clarification (e.g. social security, pension, unemployment benefits, etc.). However if the net amount is really lower (and not to the level of a decent salary), it is expected that, under the principle of co-funding of EU grants, the employer will contribute to the gross amount.
- The question is also linked to those raised under award criteria 3 and 5, i.e. how does the programme structure and the consortium partners' role ensure a **balanced share of responsibility** among the partners from the content, organisational and financial point of view. If different payment approaches are followed for the same candidate (as a result of the successive mobility periods) or for different candidates (in accordance with their "recruitment institution"), any consequences on the amounts perceived (and, if applicable, the social security coverage) should be clearly described under this question.

B.4.5 Describe the measures taken by the consortium to ensure the candidate's **career prospects** and to monitor his/her career development once graduated.

- Associated partners may play an important role under this criterion.
- Experts should look for references to alumni associations (institutional or international) or to specific actions carried out or envisaged by the consortium for keeping track of its graduated doctors (e.g. tracer surveys, track records of PhD employments in the participating organisation, etc.)

B.4.6 Describe the nature and comprehensiveness of the **Doctoral Candidate Agreement**.

What are the joint course implementation rules and mechanisms, mutual rights, obligations and responsibilities of the two parties as concerns the academic, administrative and financial aspects of the candidates' participation in the EMJD? Specify in what way the consortium adheres to and implements the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Good Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers.

- Each selected EMJD will be required to produce such a Doctoral candidate Agreement prior to the beginning of the first edition of the joint programme.

- At this stage, experts should look for evidence of models (if any) but more importantly, assess the degree of coverage consortia intend to give to these agreements (see list of the different aspects to be addressed in the question itself).
- The Doctoral Candidate Agreement should have the double objective of clarifying as extensively as possible the EMJD implementation and participation conditions, thereby avoiding as far as possible any dispute between the two parties during the EMJD period.

B.5 Programme Management and Quality Assurance (15% of the max. score)

This criterion will explore the overall organisational arrangements and cooperation mechanisms within the consortium and will also look into the foreseen evaluation and sustainability plans as well as the existence of complementary funding.

Given that criterion B.3 explores the overall integration of the consortium and the functioning of the programme the answers to the questions should also be checked for their consistency with the answers given under this criterion that concerns the overall programme management and quality assurance

B.5.1 Describe the quality of the **organisational arrangements and cooperation mechanisms within the consortium and the specific role played by each of its members.**

What is the degree of institutional commitment of the consortium's partners, and what financial and human resources are allocated to the programme? Is there a management and supervision board? How clearly defined and active is the role of all partners? How will a feed-back system be established and used? Does the consortium foresee detailed partnership agreements covering the academic, scientific and administrative aspects of the programme and how are they going to be used?

- Under these questions experts should assess the degree of institutional commitment given to the EMJD by the partner institutions as well as the quality and solidity of the management and monitoring measures envisaged to ensure the efficient functioning of the joint programme.
- Experts are invited to read carefully the endorsement letters (or any relevant annex document, such as for instance co-tutelle agreements) in order to assess the degree of institutional commitment given by the partners to the proposal (i.e. are the endorsement letters signed at institutional level, do they refer clearly to the proposal, do they address concrete issues – e.g. financial or related to the joint recognition - and/or elements specific to the partners concerned, etc.?)

B.5.2 Describe the consortium's **development and sustainability plan is designed in order to ensure the proper implementation and continuity of the joint programme beyond Community funding.**

What strategies have been envisaged, and over which period? What are the enrolment projections and the mid/long-term benefits for the partners? If applicable, are associated members involved in this sustainability plan and what degree of commitment can they provide?

- This question should be assessed in conjunction with question B.5.3 below.
- EM Programme's financial contribution to an EMJD should not constitute the only “raison d’être” of the joint programme nor its only funding source. Under this question, EMJD applicants should present a clear development and sustainability plan that could ensure the continuity of the EMJD beyond the EM programme’s funding period.
- Experts should ensure that the number of doctoral candidates expected to be recruited each year goes beyond the number of scholarships awarded by the programme.
- Concrete initiatives intending to involve organisations/actors external to the consortium should be assessed positively.

B.5.3 To what extent have **complementary funding** possibilities been explored and/or secured?

How do these possibilities provide additional (full or partial) fellowships to additional doctoral candidates and, if applicable, top up the difference between the fixed programme contribution to the candidates' participation costs and the actual cost for the consortium?

- This question should be assessed in conjunction with question B.5.2 above.
- Any concrete (/evidenced) initiative taken by the consortium to secure additional funding for the joint programme and more importantly for the participation of additional doctorate candidates should be encouraged and assessed positively.
- See also question B.2.4 for the formal contribution of non-educational actors to the funding and support of the EMJD, and, if applicable, B.3.4 for the consortium co-funding of any fee amount in excess of the programme's contribution to the participation costs.

B.5.4 Describe the nature of the **internal evaluation** (by the institutions themselves? through candidates/scholars feed-back systems? etc.) and **external quality assessment** (by e.g. national, international or professional bodies) envisaged.

How (and with what periodicity) will these evaluation exercises be organized (by the institutions themselves, through an integrated approach agreed by all partner institutions, with questionnaires and feed-back systems, etc.)? What will the roles of the national, international or professional quality assurance bodies be, if any? How will the actors (students / professors) be involved in this exercise? Will external experts be recruited for this purpose and - if yes - on what basis and how often? What methodology will be followed? If applicable, will associated members be involved in this exercise? How will the assessment outcomes be used to monitor, upgrade and improve the quality of the programme?

- Experts should look for concrete evidence of the involvement of external evaluators (incl. the identification of their origin, the regularity and methodology to the Quality Assessment review, etc.)
- Reference to the traditional methods of evaluation implemented by European universities for their academic courses should be assessed with caution since they do not necessarily fit the specific conditions and requirements of research activities.
- (Concrete and justified) reference to the Quality Assessment Handbook produced for the implementation and monitoring of Erasmus Mundus Masters Courses should be judged positively (as long as this reference takes into account the specificity of a joint doctorate programme as opposed to a joint masters course)

4. EMJDs - Ethical issues table

A crosscheck should be done by the experts whether any of the proposals concern any research ethical issues area(s) as these are described below. In case such an area is identified during the assessment experts should make a comment to the Agency using the "Comments to the Agency" box in the online assessment tool (see section 5.5 of this manual)

ETHICAL ISSUES TABLE

| Research on Human Embryo/Foetus | |
|---|--|
| Does the proposed research involve human Embryos? | |
| Does the proposed research involve human Foetal Tissues/Cells? | |
| Does the proposed research involve human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)? | |
| Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture? | |
| Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve derivation of cells from Embryos? | |
| Research on Humans | |
| Does the proposed research involve children? | |
| Does the proposed research involve patients? | |
| Does the proposed research involve persons not able to give consent? | |
| Does the proposed research involve adult healthy volunteers? | |
| Does the proposed research involve Human genetic material? | |
| Does the proposed research involve Human biological samples? | |
| Does the proposed research involve Human data collection? | |
| Privacy | |
| Does the proposed research involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)? | |
| Does the proposed research involve tracking the location or observation of people? | |
| Research on Animals | |
| Does the proposed research involve research on animals? | |
| Are those animals transgenic small laboratory animals? | |
| Are those animals transgenic farm animals? | |
| Are those animals non-human primates? | |
| Are those animals cloned farm animals? | |
| Research Involving Developing Countries | |
| Does the proposed research involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant, etc)? | |
| Is the proposed research of benefit to local communities (e.g. capacity building, access to healthcare, education, etc)? | |
| Dual Use | |
| Research having direct military use | |
| Research having the potential for terrorist abuse | |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| Country | Duration (ECTS) Modify as needed | Joint Degree (if applicable please refer to the corresponding legislation) | Double/multiple Degree (if applicable please refer to the corresponding legislation) | Additional comments | Usefull Links |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| BELGIUM (FR) | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | The Joint Degree is issued in addition to one of the legal degrees listed in the French Community legislation. | equi.sup@cfwb.be |
| BELGIUM (NL) | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | article 94, §3 of the Law on Higher Education Reform April 4, 2003 | http://www.nvao.net/joint-degrees |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible - the Higher Education Act No. 111/1998 Coll. | Possible - the Higher Education Act No. 111/1998 Coll. | All study programmes provided by Czech HEIs including joint/double degree must be approved by the Accreditation Commission of the Czech Republic. | the Higher Education Act http://www.msmt.cz/uploads/Areas_of_work/higher_education/Act_No_111_1998.pdf ; Rules for accreditation (in Czech only) http://www.akreditacnikomise.cz/cs/standardy-pro-posuzovani-zadosti/160-joint-degrees.html |
| DENMARK | 90 / 60 / 120 | Only possible in exceptional cases. | Possible | | On law and decrees: http://www.ubst.dk/en/laws-and-decrees On Danish qualifications: http://en.iu.dk/education-in-denmark/understanding-danish-qualifications |
| GERMANY | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | All international study programmes (BA and MA) have to be accredited or recognised. The rules for recognition of | Legal Documents (German only): - Structural guidelines incl. list of |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>degrees are set by the German "Länder" (regions). While a bachelor degree requires 180 - 240 ECTS, a masters degree requires additional 60-120 ECTS. Entry requirement for a masters programme is a first degree (Bachelor, Magister Artium, Diploma, etc.). In principle, a masters degree awarded by German HEIs (University, Technical University, University of Applied Sciences) entitles to enter a doctoral programme. However, entry requirements are specified by each HEI in their doctoral degree regulations. PHD programmes are not structured along ECTS. PhD programmes are set-up under the authority of HEIs (no rules for recognition from central level).</p> | <p>degrees that can be awarded (Ländergemeinsame Strukturvorgaben): http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2003/2003_10_10-Laendergemeinsame-Strukturvorgaben.pdf - Rules for the accreditation of study programmes (published by the Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany - Accreditation Council) http://www.akkreditierungsrat.de/fileadmin/Seiteninhalte/Beschluesse_AR/Beschluss_Regeln_Studiengaenge_Systemakkreditierung_10122010.pdf</p> |
| ESTONIA | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible (Royal Decree 56/2005 of 21 January 2005); however, a Ministerial Order implementing the Royal Decree is needed and will be adopted in early 2006. | Possible | | |
| SPAIN | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible (Royal | Possible | | |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|---|----------|--|---|
| | | Decree 56/2005 of 21 January 2005); however, a Ministerial Order implementing the Royal Decree is needed and will be adopted in early 2006. | | | |
| FRANCE | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible (law 11th May 2005) if national degree already recognised in the same discipline as the joint degree | Possible | International co-tutelle possible (6th January 2005 Decree : http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jopdf/commission/jo_pdf.jsp?numJO=0&dateJO=20050113&numTexte=4&pageDebut=00553&pageFin=00553 | 1) 2005 Decree on joint degrees : http://www.europe-education-formation.fr/docs/Erasmus-Mundus/decret-sur-delivrance-diplome-conjoint.pdf2) 2006 Notice from Ministry of Education on creation and awarding of degrees in the frame of LMD (Bachelor-Master-Doctorate) system : http://www.education.gouv.fr/bo/2006/47/MENS0603037C.htm |
| GREECE | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | | <u>Legislative framework for postgraduate programmes</u> http://www.et.gr - search for law 3685/2008 (Official Gazette 148/issue A/16-7-2008) |
| IRELAND | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible. (Universities Act 1997 and | Possible | 90 ECTS is more common. Check with individual HEIs. | |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | Qualifications (Education and Training) Act 1999) | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| ITALY | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | | |
| CYPRUS | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible. Public Universities can offer Joint Degrees in cooperation with other HEIs (Regulations for Studies and Student Affairs - University of Cyprus - Reg No.172/2006). Private Universities can offer Joint Degrees subject to approval and evaluation by the Evaluation Committee for Private Universities. | Possible | | |
| LITHUANIA | 90 / 60 / 120 | Not possible | Possible | | |
| LATVIA | 60 / 90 / 120 (Master's Degree full time studies with length of 1 or 2 years, but for recognition not less than ECTS 300 together for | Not possible | Possible. The current existing legislation does not mention joint degrees at all, nevertheless it is not forbidden to establish joint | The current existing legislation does not mention joint degrees at all. This situation creates problems and limitations to these higher education institutions, which would like to participate in joint degree programmes. As a result, it is not forbidden to establish joint programmes, but the ways of awarding degrees after completion of such programmes can only take place as awarding one (or several) national degrees of the partner institutions or a national | *) Law on Institutions of Higher Education: http://izm.izm.gov.lv/laws-regulations.html *) For accreditation: Higher Education Quality Evaluation Centre: http://www.aiknc.lv ; *) For recognition: Academic Information Centre: http://www.aic.lv ; *) |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|---|--|--|
| | Bachelor's + Master's Degrees (at least 5 years studies altogether) in total are needed (defined by Law on Higher Education Institutions, Article 57 (1)) | | programmes. The state template of diplomas is regulated by national regulations and therefore only double or multiple degrees are possible. | certificate plus an unofficial certificate in the name of the whole consortium. Legislation explicitly allowing and encouraging joint degrees has been drafted as part of the draft Law on Higher Education which has been submitted for adoption. It will introduce joint higher education programmes and joint degrees into Latvian legislation. | Different other useful reference materials - Documents and Publications , incl. link to Cabinet of Ministers Regulations - Procedure of Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions, Colleges And Higher Education Programmes: http://www.aiknc.lv/en/kopmat |
| LUXEMBURG | 90 / 60 / 120 | | | | |
| HUNGARY | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible (Legislation: Act CXXXIX of 2005 on Higher Education Section 117 (4)) | Possible (Legislation: Act CXXXIX of 2005 on Higher Education Section 117 (4)) | Minimum duration of studies is 180 ECTS at bachelor level and 60 ECTS at master level. | Ministry of National Resources: http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-national-resources Hungarian Equivalence and Information Centre (ENIC / NARIC Office): http://www.oh.gov.hu/main.php?folderID=3351 Educational Authority www.oh.gov.hu Hungarian Accreditation Committee: http://www.mab.hu/english/index.html Act on Higher Education in |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------|---|--|
| | | | | | English: http://www.okm.gov.hu/letoit/nemzet/naric/act_cxxxix_2005.pdf |
| MALTA | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | recognition according to the principles of the LRC as long as institutions and programmes are accredited in their respective countries | |
| THE NETHERLANDS | 90 / 60 / 120 . Few exceptions are possible. | Possible. (Legislation adopted in Parliament made joint degrees legally possible from July 2010 onward: Act: WHW new article 7.3 for Bachelor and Master programmes). However formal implementation needs accreditation and registration and takes time. No accreditation/registration of a formal international joint programme has taken place yet. | Possible. | An institution in the Netherlands can award a degree to anyone who successfully completes an accredited study programme. The Accreditation Organization of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) is responsible for the accreditation of academically oriented higher education programmes (wo) and higher professionally oriented education study programmes (hbo). The organization's tasks arise from the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW). Accreditation takes place at the request of the institutions, based on assessment reports produced by review and assessment boards. Accredited programmes are registered in the Central Register of Higher Education Study Programmes (CROHO), which contains an overview of all accredited study programmes in the Netherlands. | Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders: http://www.ib-groep.nl/zakelijk/ho/croho/raadplegen_croho.asp : contains an overview of all accredited study programmes in the Netherlands |
| | | | | <u>“Proof of recognition” Erasmus Mundus masters programmes</u> Dutch Higher Education Institutions participating in an EM master programma are required to include in their application a copy of the | |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | CROHO register as “proof of recognition” of the degree (as stated in the document “Instructions for completing the 2011 Erasmus Mundus action 1 application form”, page 24-25). In case the accreditation of the degree has not been completed, a copy of the accreditation request should be included. | |
| AUSTRIA | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | | |
| POLAND | 90 / 60 / 120 | Not possible, but new law in preparation | Possible (Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of 18 December 2008 on the types of degrees awarded to graduates and the pattern for diplomas and certificates issued by higher education institutions). | | |
| PORTUGAL | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible (Decree-Law 74/2006 of the 24th march) | Possible (Decree-Law 74/2006 of the 24th march) | | |
| SLOVENIA | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | NAccording slovenian | *"Higher Education Act", Article 36 provides the following: each academic year | Uradni list Republike Slovenije (Official Gazette |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|---|--|--|
| | | | "Higher Education Act" double/multiple degrees not foreseen. | corresponds to 60 ECTS. Master study programme may go on from 1 to 2 years corresponding the ECTS from 60 to 120 but must together with undergraduate study programme in the same academic discipline last 5 years – 300 ECTS (for example: 3-year undergraduate study programme – 180 ECTS must be continued with 2-year master – 120 ECTS; 4-year undergraduate study programme – 240 ECTS must be continued with 1-year master – 60 ECTS). However there is no legal impediment for having 1,5 year master study programmes – 90 ECTS in Slovenia, provided that there exists undergraduate study programme in the same academic discipline lasting 3,5 years – 210 ECTS (currently there are no undergraduate study programmes lasting 3,5 years). | of the Republic of Slovenia, Higher Education Act - available in slovenian language): http://www.dz-rs.si/index.php?id=101&vt=7&sm=k&q=zakon+o+visokem+%C5%A1olstvu&mandate=1&unid=UPB 233CC0BBD4001F20C125766B002560DC&showdoc=1 ; Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education: http://www.nakvis.si/indexang.html |
| SLOVAK REPUBLIC | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible (law N°131/2002 Z.Z. adopted in 2008) | Possible (law N°131/2002 Z.Z. adopted in 2008) | | http://www.uips.sk/sub/uips.sk/images/PKvs/z131_2002.pdf |
| FINLAND | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible with some restrictions | Possible | Legislation requires the award of a degree certificate in national language (Finnish/Swedish) | http://www.oph.fi/koulutus_ja_tutkinnot/tutkintojen_tunnustaminen/ammattillisten_tutkintojen_tunnustamiseen_liittyva_kansainvalinen_yhteisty |
| SWEDEN | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible, by decision in the Parliament and written in the Higher Education Act. | Possible | Based on the principle that if the HEI has the right to issue a national degree in a certain area and level it also have the right to issue a joint degree at the same area and | |

ANNEX : JOINT MASTERs DEGREES IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

| | | | | level. | |
|----------------|---------------|---|---|--|---|
| UNITED KINGDOM | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible, but depending on the regulation of each institution | Possible, but depending on the regulation of each institution | NA requires all selected EMMC applicants to produce evidence that their institution has recognised the proposed degree in the form of a signed document of the governing body or head of institution | http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/EducationAndLearning/QualificationsExplained/DG_10039017 http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/FHEQ/default.asp |
| ICELAND | 90 / 60 / 120 | Not possible, but new law in preparation | Possible | | |
| LIECHTENSTEIN | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | | |
| NORWAY | 90 / 60 / 120 | Possible | Possible | | |
| BULGARIA | 90 / 60 / 120 | Not possible | Possible | | |