

Decision on the Evaluation Result

Study programme:

“Joint Master in Food, Nutrition and Health” (FOOD-H)

offered by **University of Padova** (UniPD, Italy, coordinator) in cooperation with **University of Lyon 1** (Lyon1, France), **University of Agriculture in Krakow** (UAK, Poland), **University of Granada** (UGR, Spain), **University of British Columbia** (UBC, Canada).


Based on the report of the expert panel issued on 5 May 2026, amended by a corrigendum on 11 May 2026, the Direction¹ of the Agency for Scientific and University Quality of Andalusia decides:

1. The master degree programme “**Joint Master in Food, Nutrition and Health**” offered by University of Padova (Italy) in cooperation with University of Lyon 1 (France), University of Agriculture in Krakow (Poland), University of Granada (Spain), University of British Columbia (Canada) is accredited according to the criteria and procedures defined in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

The study programme complies with the requirements defined by the European Approach for Quality assurance of Joint Programmes and the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) in its current version.

2. The accreditation is given for a period of **six years**, valid until 5/5/2032.
3. A follow-up report shall be submitted to ACCUA by the end of the third year of implementation of the joint programme. The consortium shall provide ACCUA with a report detailing how each recommendation for improvement from the panel (section 11.1 of the review report) has been addressed, including supporting evidence. The follow-up report may also include any other relevant changes to the programme in relation to the quality assurance standards defined in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

¹Consultation of the European Approach Reporting Commission has not been necessary as it is a single evaluation report.

Puede verificar la integridad de este documento mediante la lectura del código QR adjunto o mediante el acceso a la dirección https://ws050.juntadeandalucia.es/verificarFirma indicando el código de VERIFICACIÓN			
FIRMADO POR	MIGUEL RAFAEL AGUILAR URBANO	11/05/2026	
VERIFICACIÓN	Pk2jmBRN6ADQP92M7G6CZZXD79ZPLD	PÁG. 1/4	

The following recommendations are given for further improvement of the programme:

STANDARD 1: ELIGIBILITY

1.1. Status

- N/A

1.2. Joint Design and Delivery

- Strengthen the co-design of the programme by incorporating the perspectives of key stakeholders, including students. Students and other stakeholders should be actively and systematically involved in the programme development and review processes.

1.3. Cooperation Agreement

- Further clarify and harmonise selection criteria, mobility arrangements, and assessment procedures (including grading and thesis rules) to enhance transparency, consistency, and joint programme integration.
- The financial framework, including the underlying budget structure, cost-sharing arrangements, and long-term financial sustainability should be described in greater detail to enhance clarity and sustainability.

STANDARD 2: LEARNING OUTCOMES

2.1. Level


- N/A

2.2. Disciplinary field

- Clearly prioritise the primary Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) addressed by each module, avoiding excessive or systematic mapping to a large number of outcomes.
- Clarify the distinct academic contribution and progressive development of competences within the specialisation pathways, particularly in the Food Neuroscience track, and reduce redundancies in module descriptions and PLO mapping.
- Further articulate the disciplinary positioning, academic depth, and intended graduate profile of the Food Neuroscience pathway to ensure consistency between its denomination and its curriculum content.
- Ensure that highly specialised courses are coherently integrated into the overarching FOOD-H framework and contribute clearly to the overall identity of the joint degree. The consortium could further strengthen the alignment between the three specialisation pathways offered in the third semester and the internship/thesis opportunities available in the fourth semester.
- Make sure all second-year pathways build upon a shared core of competences and collectively lead to a coherent and recognisable graduate profile for the joint programme.

2.3. Achievement

- Finalise and fully implement the Student Handbook, ensuring that it provides complete and consistent information on academic, administrative, support information, and practical arrangements across partner institutions.
- Further specify how the achievement of Programme Learning Outcomes is demonstrated and monitored at joint programme level, ensuring consistency across partner institutions and pathways.

Puede verificar la integridad de este documento mediante la lectura del código QR adjunto o mediante el acceso a la dirección https://ws050.juntadeandalucia.es/verificarFirma indicando el código de VERIFICACIÓN			
FIRMADO POR	MIGUEL RAFAEL AGUILAR URBANO	11/05/2026	
VERIFICACIÓN	Pk2jmBRN6ADQP92M7G6CZZXD79ZPLD	PÁG. 2/4	

- Clarify the academic implementation and evaluation of the alternance (work-study) option within the joint programme framework.

2.4. Regulated Professions

N/A.

STANDARD 3: STUDY PROGRAMME

3.1. Curriculum

- Review and, where necessary, improve the contents of specific courses or modules, particularly in areas such as food science and technology, to ensure all intended learning outcomes can be fully achieved by students from diverse academic backgrounds.

3.2. Credits

- Clarify the academic status, intended learning outcomes, and workload implications of the non-credited introductory neuroscience module in Path 1 to ensure transparency and proper alignment with the ECTS principles.

3.3. Workload

N/A.

STANDARD 4: ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION

4.1. Admission

- Provide clear, objective, and transparent definitions of selection criteria and weighting components, particularly for categories related to additional achievements, special circumstances, and personal statements.
- Clarify the expected applicant profile and academic prerequisites, and ensure consistency of key information provided to applicants.

4.2. Recognition

N/A.


STANDARD 5: LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

5.1. Learning and teaching

N/A.

5.2. Assessment of students

- Implement mechanisms ensuring that the level of academic difficulty and assessment standards across the three specialisation pathways in the third semester remain broadly equivalent.
- Clarify the assessment framework applied to the Master's thesis, including the procedures, criteria, and responsibilities for its evaluation, and further develop an explicit framework to support consistency and comparability of student assessment across partner institutions.
- Ensure that assessment methods are fully aligned with intended learning outcomes and that documentation consistently reflects objective criteria and validation procedures.

<p>Puede verificar la integridad de este documento mediante la lectura del código QR adjunto o mediante el acceso a la dirección https://ws050.juntadeandalucia.es/verificarFirma indicando el código de VERIFICACIÓN</p>			
FIRMADO POR	MIGUEL RAFAEL AGUILAR URBANO	11/05/2026	
VERIFICACIÓN	Pk2jmBRN6ADQP92M7G6CZZXD79ZPLD	PÁG. 3/4	

STANDARD 6: STUDENT SUPPORT

- Ensure that all relevant programme information, including practical aspects of mobility and student support services, scholarships, is fully accessible through a dedicated and regularly updated website.

STANDARD 7: RESOURCES

7.1. Academic, administration and services staff

N/A.

7.2. Facilities and material resources

N/A.

STANDARD 8: TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION

- Ensure that the public website provides complete and up-to-date information fully aligned with the Consortium Agreement, including clear details on admission and recruitment procedures.


STANDARD 9: QUALITY ASSURANCE

- Establish and implement dedicated internal quality assurance procedures for the programme to monitor and verify the achievement of learning outcomes across all partner institutions. The consortium should establish a specific Quality Assurance body and define a clear plan of activities to ensure the smooth implementation of the Joint Master's degree. Joint quality assurance procedures should include clearly defined responsibilities, monitoring mechanisms, and reporting processes to oversee and maintain the quality of the programme across partner institutions.

With regard to the rationale behind this decision the Direction refers to the attached evaluation report.

In Córdoba, on the date of the electronic signature.

THE DIRECTOR

Puede verificar la integridad de este documento mediante la lectura del código QR adjunto o mediante el acceso a la dirección https://ws050.juntadeandalucia.es/verificarFirma indicando el código de VERIFICACIÓN			
FIRMADO POR	MIGUEL RAFAEL AGUILAR URBANO	11/05/2026	
VERIFICACIÓN	Pk2jmBRN6ADQP92M7G6CZZXD79ZPLD	PÁG. 4/4	

Evaluation Report by the Review Panel

Name of the Programme: Joint Master in Food, Nutrition and Health (FOOD-H)

Name of the Coordinating Institution: University of Padova

Evaluation coordinated by ACCUA in accordance with the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	5
ASSESSMENT OF EACH STANDARD.....	7
STANDARD 1: ELIGIBILITY	7
1.1. Status.....	7
1.2. Joint Design and Delivery	8
1.3. Cooperation Agreement.....	10
STANDARD 2: LEARNING OUTCOMES	12
2.1. Level.....	12
2.2. Disciplinary field.....	13
2.3. Achievement.....	15
2.4. Regulated Professions.....	16
STANDARD 3: STUDY PROGRAMME	17
3.1. Curriculum.....	17
3.2. Credits.....	19
3.3. Workload	20
STANDARD 4: ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION.....	21
4.1. Admission	21
4.2. Recognition	22
STANDARD 5: LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT.....	23
5.1. Learning and teaching	23
5.2. Assessment of students	25
STANDARD 6: STUDENT SUPPORT	26
STANDARD 7: RESOURCES	27
7.1. Academic, administration and services staff.....	27
7.2. Facilities and material resources.....	29
STANDARD 8: TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION.....	29
STANDARD 9: QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	31
CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION PROPOSAL	32
11.1. The Review Panel Assessment per Standard	32
ANNEXES	37
REVIEW PANEL	37
VISIT PROGRAMME	39
LIST OF EVALUATED DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE AND OTHER ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE.....	40



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Quality Assurance Agency Coordinating the Review:

The review is coordinated by ACCUA.

Universities Participating in the Consortium:

The consortium comprises five universities: University of Padova (Italy), University of Lyon 1 (France), University of Agriculture in Kraków¹ (Poland), University of Granada (Spain), and University of British Columbia (Canada).

Joint Programme Description:

The FOOD-H Joint Master is a 120 ECTS programme delivered over four semesters (30 ECTS per semester). The first year provides a common foundation at the University of Padova, while the second year offers three specialisation pathways: Food Neuroscience at Lyon 1, Food and Dietetics at Kraków, and Food and Nutrition at Granada. The fourth semester is dedicated to the Master Thesis, which can be completed at either Lyon or UBC. The programme integrates multidisciplinary aspects, combining food science, nutrition, health, and related biomedical and social sciences. Instruction is delivered in English using a combination of lectures, workshops, laboratory and field activities, collaborative projects, and e-learning components. Students acquire both academic competencies and professional skills, including research methodology, critical thinking, problem-solving, and practical experience through internships and applied projects. Mobility is embedded, with all students required to study in at least two countries.

Strengths of the Programme:

- Integration within the ARQUS alliance, providing a strong international framework for the programme.
- Joint programme well designed, offering a clear academic pathway for students across the participating sites.
- Interdisciplinary approach combining Food Science and Health.
- Well-structured curriculum with progressive development from foundational knowledge to specialised competences and clear development and alignment of the Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs).
- Course guidebooks that are complete and detailed, clearly describing learning outcomes, contents, and assessment methods.
- Cooperation Agreement and bilateral agreement with BC are well developed.

¹ Uniwersytet Rolniczy im. Hugona Kołłątaja w Krakowie.



- Students Handbook already prepared, providing guidance on academic regulations and procedures, although some elements still need completion.
- Qualified academic, administrative, and technical staff with strong expertise and teaching quality.
- Very good facilities and learning resources available to support programme delivery.
- Robust student support services addressing mobility, accommodation, visas, inclusion, and diversity.
- Active network of associated partners (companies and research laboratories) willing to participate in the programme.

Recommendations for Improvement:

- Strengthen the co-design of the programme by incorporating the perspectives of key stakeholders, including students. Students and other stakeholders should be actively and systematically involved in the programme development and review processes.
- The financial framework, including the underlying budget structure, cost-sharing arrangements, and long-term financial sustainability should be described in greater detail to enhance clarity and sustainability.
- Clearly prioritise the primary Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) addressed by each module, avoiding excessive or systematic mapping to a large number of outcomes.
- Make sure the distinct academic contribution and progressive development of competences within specialised tracks, particularly in the Food Neuroscience pathway, and reduce redundancies in module descriptions and PLO mapping.
- Further clarify and substantiate the disciplinary positioning, academic depth, and intended graduate profile of the Food Neuroscience pathway to ensure full consistency between its denomination and its curriculum content.
- Ensure that the highly specialised courses are coherently integrated into the overall FOOD-H framework and contribute clearly to the identity of the joint degree. The consortium could further strengthen the alignment between the three specialisation pathways offered in the third semester and the internship/thesis opportunities available in the fourth semester.
- Assure that all second-year pathways build upon a shared core of competences and collectively lead to a coherent and recognisable graduate profile for the joint programme.
- Ensure that the Student Handbook is fully developed and provides clear and comprehensive information on academic, administrative, and student support arrangements.



- Review and, where necessary, improve the contents of specific courses or modules, particularly in areas such as food science and technology, to guarantee that all intended learning outcomes can be fully achieved by students from diverse academic backgrounds.
- Clarify the academic status, intended learning outcomes, and workload implications of the non-credited introductory neuroscience module in Path 1, and ensure its transparency and alignment with the ECTS principles.
- Provide clear, objective, and fair definitions of selection criteria and weighting components, particularly for categories covering additional achievements, special circumstances, and personal statements.
- Implement mechanisms ensuring that the level of academic difficulty and assessment standards across the three specialisation pathways in the third semester remain broadly equivalent. Greater clarity would also be beneficial regarding the assessment framework applied to the Master's thesis, including the procedures, criteria, and responsibilities involved in its evaluation. The development of a more explicit equivalent grading framework could further strengthen consistency and comparability of student assessment across partner institutions.
- Ensure that assessment methods are fully aligned with intended learning outcomes and that documentation consistently reflects objective criteria and validation procedures.
- Ensure that all relevant programme information, including practical aspects of mobility and student support services, scholarships, is fully accessible through a dedicated and regularly updated website.
- Ensure that the public website provides complete and up-to-date information fully aligned with the Consortium Agreement, including clear details on admission and recruitment procedures.
- Establish and implement dedicated internal quality assurance procedures for the programme to monitor and verify the achievement of learning outcomes across all partner institutions. The consortium should create a specific Quality Assurance body and define a clear plan of activities to ensure the smooth implementation of the Joint Master's degree. Joint quality assurance procedures should include clearly defined responsibilities, monitoring mechanisms, and reporting processes to oversee and maintain the quality of the programme across the partner institutions.



INTRODUCTION

A) The procedure conducted for the review process

UGR requested ACCUA the ex-ante evaluation of the joint master programme according to the European Approach, providing the self-evaluation report (SER) according to the proposed format and annexes as additional evidence. ACCUA nominated the expert panel. ACCUA provided an online training session for the panel. Each member of the panel analysed the self-evaluation report and provided an individual assessment. In a meeting of the panel, these individual reports were discussed and additional information was requested to the Consortium. The additional information was sent to the panel members before the visit. The external visit was held online and took place on March 11th and 13th, 2026. With all the information provided by the Consortium and the external visit, the panel issues this preliminary report.

B) Information on the review panel and its activity

Composition of the review panel

President:	Mr. Alberto Oleaga Páramo
Members:	Mrs. Paola Pittia
	Mr. Thierry Thomas-Danguin
	Mr. Krzysztof Jadczyk
Secretary:	Mrs. María Paz Espinosa Alejos

Coordination of the review process

The review process and the internal procedures to nominate the expert panel have been coordinated by ACCUA and developed according to the European Approach.

Description of the panel visit

The visit took place online, on March 11th and 13th, 2026. The agenda was agreed with the coordinating university and the expert panel. The coordinating university provided a list of participants who attended the different sessions via Webex platform. ACCUA organised the online visit and provided technical assistance. The visit took place without any remarkable incidence. All planned meetings were held and most of participants attended.

Coordination for the review report writing

The provisional report has been elaborated by the secretary of the review panel taking into consideration the individual reports of all members of the panel and the findings during the visit.



INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME

Name of the program: Joint Master in Food, Nutrition and Health

EQF level: 7

Degree awarded: Master

Number of ECTS points: 120

Program duration: 2 years

ISCED field(s) of study: 05-Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Statistics, 051 Biological and related sciences, Nutrition science. 07 Engineering, Manufacturing and Construction, 072 Manufacturing and processing, 0721 Food processing, Food science and technology. 09 Health and Welfare, 091 Health, 0915 Therapy and rehabilitation, Nutrition/Dietetics.

Institutions delivering the programme

Name of the higher education institution	Degree awarding	Role
University of Padova	Yes	Coordinator
University of Granada	Yes	Partner
University of Lyon 1	Yes	Partner
University of Cracow	Yes	Partner
University of British Columbia	No	Associate partner



ASSESSMENT OF EACH STANDARD

STANDARD 1: ELIGIBILITY

1.1. Status

All four degree-awarding partner institutions — Università degli Studi di Padova (Italy, Coordinator), Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1 (France), Uniwersytet Rolniczy im. Hugona Kołłątaja w Krakowie (Poland), and Universidad de Granada (Spain) — are officially recognised higher education institutions within their respective national systems. The documentation provided in the self-evaluation report (Annex 1 and Annex 3) confirms their legal status and their entitlement to participate in joint programmes and to award a joint degree.

The relevant national legal frameworks in Italy, France, Spain, and Poland allow these institutions to engage in joint degree provision and to implement the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (EA). The proposed degree will be embedded within the higher education systems of the four participating countries, ensuring its legal validity within the European Higher Education Area.

Although some supporting documents are not available in English, their formal inclusion in the dossier substantiates the institutions' recognised status and legal capacity.

The University of British Columbia participates as an associated partner and is not a degree-awarding institution within the programme; therefore, its involvement does not affect the legal conformity of the joint degree.

The programme demonstrates clear European relevance and presents a well-substantiated rationale for the establishment of a joint initiative of this nature. A notable strength is the structured mobility scheme, which enables students to study at different institutions and to pursue specialised pathways during the second year.

Documentary evidence

- Self-Evaluation Report (SER).
- Annex 1, which contains the legal statutes of the four partner universities (primarily provided in their original languages).
- Annex 3, which includes documentation confirming the institutions' entitlement to participate in joint programmes (also largely in the original languages).
- Table 5 of the SER, outlining the status of the external quality assurance systems and programme accreditation frameworks in Spain, Italy, France, and Poland.



Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.

1.2. Joint Design and Delivery

The programme is presented as jointly designed and delivered by the participating institutions, building on previous academic cooperation frameworks, including collaborations within the ARQUS European Universities Alliance, Erasmus mobility agreements, and research partnerships. All partner institutions, under the coordination of the University of Padova, are assigned defined roles and responsibilities in both academic and administrative implementation.

The governance structure is formally described in the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and the Cooperation Agreement. It includes bodies such as the Academic Board (also referred to in different sections as the Academic Commission or FOOD-H Commission), the Selection Committee, and the Joint Secretariat. These bodies are entrusted with responsibilities related to curriculum development, student admission and selection, quality assurance, financial management, and overall programme coordination. However, inconsistencies in terminology across the documentation (e.g., references to “Academic Board,” “Academic Commission,” and “FOOD-H Commission”) reduce clarity and may affect the coherence of the governance description.

While the documentation states that the curriculum, mobility structure, selection criteria, examination regulations, and degree-awarding procedures have been jointly defined, limited documentary evidence is provided to substantiate the process of joint curriculum design (e.g., timeline, records of meetings, or formal approvals). During the visit, the consortium coordinators confirmed that the programme presented is the result of deep collaboration between the partners and of a stable structure provided by the ARQUS European Universities Alliance. The partners have been working together for a long time and hold other joint degrees. The programme structure reflects coordinated delivery, with shared and parallel responsibilities across institutions.

A joint admission and selection procedure has been established and is managed by a dedicated committee. However, certain evaluation criteria lack detailed specification, which may affect transparency and consistency in candidate assessment.



Regarding assessment and examination, joint regulations are defined for the master's thesis. For other courses, assessment is conducted according to local institutional regulations, with grade conversion mechanisms in place. The absence of fully harmonised joint examination and grading criteria may create potential imbalances across the different study pathways. During the visit, the consortium coordinators argued that their experience with other joint degrees ensures that the assessment criteria are comparable across institutions.

Concerning quality assurance, the programme relies primarily on the internal quality assurance systems of the participating institutions, complemented by student surveys and oversight by the designated governance bodies. However, a fully articulated and consistently described joint internal quality assurance system is not clearly evidenced in the documentation, and responsibilities for QA supervision appear to overlap with academic governance functions.

The Cooperation Agreement outlines the financial framework, including the establishment of a biennial participation budget for each edition of the programme. The coordinating institution collects participation fees and distributes funds according to the agreed annual budget plan. Nevertheless, further detail on the development and justification of the participation budget would enhance transparency.

The programme reports the involvement of numerous associated partners from enterprises and research centres. While their names are partially referenced in the annexes, supporting documentation, such as letters of commitment, was not included in the provided materials. Upon request, the programme coordinators provided letters of interest from the associated partners, thereby substantiating their involvement and support.

Overall, the programme demonstrates a structured framework for joint governance and delivery. However, greater clarity, consistency in documentation, and more explicit evidence of the joint design processes and integrated quality assurance mechanisms would strengthen alignment with the requirements of joint programme standards.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 2. Cooperation agreement and its Annexes.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		



Recommendations:

- Strengthen the co-design of the programme by incorporating the perspectives of key stakeholders, including students. Students and other stakeholders should be actively and systematically involved in the programme development and review processes.

1.3. Cooperation Agreement

The Cooperation Agreement (Annex 2) provides a structured legal and operational framework governing the joint Master's programme. It addresses the essential elements expected under the European Approach framework, including:

- The denomination of the joint degree and its awarding arrangements;
- The coordination mechanisms and distribution of academic, administrative, and financial responsibilities among the partner institutions;
- Governance bodies (Academic Commission, Student Selection Committee, Joint Secretariat) and their respective roles;
- Admission and selection procedures;
- The academic programme structure and mobility pathways;
- Examination regulations, assessment methods, grade conversion, and recognition of credits;
- Degree awarding and the Diploma Supplement;
- Quality assurance arrangements;
- Financial management, including collection and redistribution of participation costs;
- Publication of programme information and student support services.

Overall, the Agreement demonstrates a substantial level of institutional integration and formally covers the key dimensions required for joint programme implementation.

However, several aspects would benefit from further clarification, harmonisation, and development. While procedures and governance structures are defined, certain selection criteria remain insufficiently specified. In particular, the allocation of points for “special circumstances” (20%) and “personal statement” (10%) lacks detailed evaluation criteria. Eligibility requirements are broadly formulated and do not clearly address discipline-specific academic prerequisites. Greater transparency and precision would strengthen fairness and consistency.

Although compulsory mobility across partner institutions is stipulated, the operational aspects of student and staff mobility are described only in general terms. Information on mobility services, logistical support, and staff mobility arrangements is limited.



Assessment generally follows local institutional regulations, supported by grade conversion tables. However, conversion mechanisms are not fully comprehensive (e.g., final graduation grades), and joint examination rules—apart from general provisions and the Master’s thesis—are not fully harmonised. The rules governing the final thesis are referenced but not comprehensively described.

Annex I presents the study plan, though some course elements remain to be finalised. Discrepancies between Annex I and other annexes (e.g., Annex 6) create inconsistencies that should be resolved to ensure documentary coherence.

The Agreement outlines shared responsibility for academic standards and foresees common monitoring tools (e.g., student questionnaires). Nevertheless, the joint internal quality assurance framework remains broadly formulated. The programme relies substantially on the individual QA systems of the partner institutions, without a fully articulated joint QA board or clearly defined joint procedures, monitoring indicators, and follow-up mechanisms.

The Agreement defines tuition fee collection and redistribution mechanisms and assigns financial management responsibilities. However, limited detail is provided regarding the underlying budget structure, cost-sharing arrangements, and long-term financial sustainability. References to external funding and student grants would benefit from clearer alignment and documentation.

Documentary evidence

- Annex 2 Cooperation agreement and its Annexes:
 - Annex I. Study Plan
 - Annex II. Participation Costs and financing

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

- Further clarify and harmonise selection criteria, mobility arrangements, and assessment procedures (including grading and thesis rules) to enhance transparency, consistency, and joint programme integration.
- The financial framework, including the underlying budget structure, cost-sharing arrangements, and long-term financial sustainability should be described in greater detail to enhance clarity and sustainability.



STANDARD 2: LEARNING OUTCOMES

2.1. Level

The intended learning outcomes of the joint Master's programme are clearly defined in the Self-Evaluation Report and related annexes. The programme specifies 27 Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs), which are comprehensively mapped against the descriptors of the second cycle (Master level) of the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA). Alignment matrices provided in the annexes demonstrate correspondence both with the FQ-EHEA and with the relevant national qualification frameworks. The learning outcomes are also positioned at European Qualifications Framework level 7 (EQF 7).

The documentation further details the alignment between Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), confirming coherence between the overall qualification profile and the individual curricular components.

The programme adopts a multidisciplinary approach in the fields of Food Science, Nutrition and Health, integrating advanced knowledge across areas such as biology, neuroscience, chemistry, and dietetics. The intended learning outcomes reflect: advanced theoretical and practical knowledge beyond first-cycle level; the ability to apply knowledge and problem-solving skills in professional, experimental, and research contexts; competence in integrating knowledge, managing complexity, and formulating informed judgements, including ethical and sustainability considerations; effective communication skills for specialist and non-specialist audiences, including professional use of English; learning skills supporting further academic development, including progression to doctoral studies.

Overall, the intended learning outcomes are appropriately positioned at Master (second-cycle) level and demonstrate clear alignment with the FQ-EHEA and applicable national qualification frameworks.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4. Learning Outcomes
- Annex 5. Course syllabi of all partners
- Annex 6. STRUCTURE OF THE CURRICULUM/STUDY PLAN"

Assessment



Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.

2.2. Disciplinary field

The joint Master’s programme is positioned at the intersection of food science, nutrition, technology, and human health. It addresses contemporary challenges related to sustainable food production, evolving food habits and trends, public health, environmental impact, biodiversity preservation, and the prevention of nutrition-related non-communicable diseases. The programme aims to equip graduates with the capacity to critically analyse the relationships between food systems, health outcomes, policy frameworks, and sustainability constraints at both European and international levels.

The intended learning outcomes encompass knowledge, skills, and competencies aligned with the multidisciplinary nature of the degree. They integrate food science, nutrition science, dietetics, food safety, sustainability, regulation, and consumer behaviour, while also drawing on complementary disciplines such as biology, chemistry, neuroscience, and data analysis. The documentation demonstrates formal alignment between Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), confirming overall academic coherence.

The programme offers three specialised second-year paths —Food Neuroscience, Clinical Dietetics, and Advanced Nutrition and Public Health— which reflect relevant and professionally meaningful disciplinary domains within the broader food–nutrition–health framework.

At the same time, certain aspects of the disciplinary structure would benefit from further clarification. The mapping of individual courses to a large number of PLOs reduces transparency regarding the primary focus and distinctive contribution of each module.

Variations in module structure and granularity across the three second-year pathways make comparison of academic progression and intensity less straightforward.

Within the Food Neuroscience pathway, several modules display overlapping learning outcomes and similar competence formulations, particularly regarding experimental design, cognitive neuroscience principles, and statistical analysis. Clearer differentiation and progression between courses would strengthen the internal coherence of the pathways.



The scope and disciplinary depth of certain pathways, particularly Food Neuroscience, would benefit from more explicit articulation to ensure a well-balanced integration of applied, cognitive, and neurobiological dimensions.

Some highly specialised modules would require clearer contextualisation within the overall identity and objectives of the joint degree.

In conclusion, the programme demonstrates a relevant and broadly coherent multidisciplinary positioning aligned with contemporary food and health challenges. However, greater precision in articulating course differentiation, pathway depth, and overall disciplinary integration would enhance transparency and strengthen the academic profile of the degree.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4. Learning Outcomes
- Annex 5. Course syllabi of all partners
- Annex 6. Structure of the Curriculum/Study Plan.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
	X	

Recommendations:

- Clearly prioritise the primary Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) addressed by each module, avoiding excessive or systematic mapping to a large number of outcomes.
- Clarify the distinct academic contribution and progressive development of competences within the specialisation pathways, particularly in the Food Neuroscience track, and reduce redundancies in module descriptions and PLO mapping.
- Further articulate the disciplinary positioning, academic depth, and intended graduate profile of the Food Neuroscience pathway to ensure consistency between its denomination and its curriculum content.



- Ensure that highly specialised courses are coherently integrated into the overarching FOOD-H framework and contribute clearly to the overall identity of the joint degree. The consortium could further strengthen the alignment between the three specialisation pathways offered in the third semester and the internship/thesis opportunities available in the fourth semester.
- Make sure all second-year pathways build upon a shared core of competences and collectively lead to a coherent and recognisable graduate profile for the joint programme.

2.3. Achievement

The joint Master's programme has been collaboratively developed by all partner institutions, with input from students, sector professionals, and academic experts. The four-semester structure is comprehensively detailed in Annexes 5 and 6, supporting the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The first year, delivered entirely at Università di Padova, provides a homogeneous foundation for all students before they choose one of three specialised pathways in the third semester. Two options are offered for the fourth semester (Internship + Thesis).

The programme provides extensive course guidebooks (Annex 5), including workload, learning outcomes, content, teaching methods, assessment criteria, and evaluation methods. Teaching is coordinated across partner universities, employing a blend of physical mobility, e-learning, laboratory work, field activities, and interactive seminars. The Student Agreement (Annex 13) and Student Handbook provide detailed information on academic obligations, workload, examinations, and student support, though some administrative details, such as visa requirements for France and Poland, remain incomplete.

Assessment methods are varied and generally appropriate for the diverse disciplinary content, including oral and written exams, individual and group work, and practical skill testing. However, many courses rely on "continuous and daily assessment in class," which is subjective and lacks clearly defined objective criteria in the syllabi. The operationalisation of innovative and student-centred teaching methods, as well as the validation of learning outcomes across partner institutions, is not consistently detailed. In particular, the alternance (work-study) option in the French pathway requires clarification on its academic evaluation within the joint framework.

While the programme is designed to enable the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, the procedures for demonstrating and monitoring their attainment at the consortium level are only partially specified. Further elaboration is needed to ensure consistency, transparency, and rigorous validation across all pathways and institutions.

In sum, the teaching, learning, and assessment framework is comprehensive and multidisciplinary, but the mechanisms for monitoring and validating learning outcomes across partners require further specification.



Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4. Learning Outcomes.
- Annex 5. Course syllabi of all partners.
- Annex 6. Structure of the Curriculum/Study Plan.
- Annex 13 Student Agreement.
- Annex 15 Student's Handbook.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

- Finalise and fully implement the Student Handbook, ensuring that it provides complete and consistent information on academic, administrative, support information, and practical arrangements across partner institutions.
- Further specify how the achievement of Programme Learning Outcomes is demonstrated and monitored at joint programme level, ensuring consistency across partner institutions and pathways.
- Clarify the academic implementation and evaluation of the alternance (work-study) option within the joint programme framework.

2.4. Regulated Professions

The SER confirms that the FOOD-H programme does not lead to a qualification in a regulated profession under the EU Directive 2005/36/EC. The standard is therefore not applicable.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.



Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved	Not applicable
			X

Recommendations:

None.

STANDARD 3: STUDY PROGRAMME

3.1. Curriculum

The joint Master’s programme is structured over four semesters (120 ECTS) to support the progressive acquisition of knowledge, skills, and competences aligned with the intended learning outcomes.

Year 1 (Semesters 1 & 2): Common foundational courses at Università di Padova (60 ECTS), providing a solid scientific and methodological basis for all students.

Year 2 (Semester 3): Specialisation paths across partner institutions. Path 1: Food and Neuroscience at Lyon 1. Path 2: Food and Dietetics at Kraków. Path 3: Food and Nutrition at Granada (30 ECTS). Pathways leverage the expertise of each university and support the development of interdisciplinary knowledge and competencies.

Year 2 (Semester 4): Internship and Master Thesis (30 ECTS) at either U. Lyon 1 or the University of British Columbia, allowing students to apply their knowledge in practical and research contexts.

Annex 5 provides detailed guidebooks for each course, including workload, learning outcomes, teaching methods, assessment criteria, and content, supporting constructive alignment with the Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs).

Jointly designed activities, including summer schools, seminars, co-supervised theses, laboratories, and fieldwork, reinforce transversal competence development. Lecturers’ mobility and coordinated teaching across institutions further enrich the learning experience.

All students are required to spend time in at least two countries, ensuring exposure to diverse academic and cultural contexts. The programme contemplates staff mobility, adding value to the quality of instruction and student engagement.



No dedicated module covers food processing, quality, and stability, which may limit the achievement of specific technical skills, especially for students without a prior background in food science.

The integration of the three second-year pathways and the thematic positioning of internship/thesis options require continued attention to ensure coherence across specialisations.

The operationalisation and contribution of collaborative online international learning was not clearly justified in the Self-Evaluation Report nor during the visit.

Knowledge prerequisites for foundational and specialised courses are not explicitly defined when it comes to the provision of support to students from diverse academic backgrounds, including graduates in Medicine.

Overall, the curriculum is well-structured, progressive, and adequate to enable achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Minor clarifications regarding thematic alignment, internship duration, and integration of pathways would enhance transparency and equivalence across the programme.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4. Learning Outcomes
- Annex 5. Course syllabi of all partners
- Annex 6. Structure of the Curriculum/Study Plan.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

- Review and, where necessary, improve the contents of specific courses or modules, particularly in areas such as food science and technology, to ensure all intended learning outcomes can be fully achieved by students from diverse academic backgrounds.



3.2. Credits

The joint Master's programme applies the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) consistently and coherently across all partner institutions. The programme comprises 120 ECTS distributed over four semesters (30 ECTS each):

Year 1 (Semesters 1 & 2): 60 ECTS of common foundational courses at Università di Padova.

Year 2, Semester 3: 30 ECTS for specialised pathways (Food Neuroscience, Food & Dietetics, Food & Nutrition).

Year 2, Semester 4: 30 ECTS allocated to the Internship and Master Thesis, undertaken at either Lyon 1 or the University of British Columbia.

The workload Allocation is such that 1 ECTS corresponds to 25 hours of student work, including contact hours and self-study. Courses are appropriately developed relative to their assigned credits, with content, teaching methods, and assessments aligned with the workload. ECTS are consistently applied, supporting automatic recognition of credits across partner institutions and compliance with joint programme requirements.

In Path 1 (Food Neuroscience), an introductory neuroscience module is described as essential but is not assigned ECTS credits; clarifying its status would improve transparency regarding workload expectations.

Overall, the application and distribution of ECTS are transparent, coherent, and in line with European standards.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4. Learning Outcomes
- Annex 5. Course syllabi of all partners
- Annex 6. Structure of the Curriculum/Study Plan.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:



-Clarify the academic status, intended learning outcomes, and workload implications of the non-credited introductory neuroscience module in Path 1 to ensure transparency and proper alignment with the ECTS principles.

3.3. Workload

The joint Master's programme comprises 120 ECTS distributed over four semesters (30 ECTS each), in full compliance with the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA) for second-cycle degrees. This structure ensures a balanced workload across the two-year programme, with no semester exceeding 30 ECTS.

Within each course, the workload—including content, practical activities, and assessments—appears proportionate to the assigned ECTS. Courses vary in size and type (theoretical, practical, or research-based) and are mapped to Programme Learning Outcomes, ensuring alignment between credit allocation and expected competencies. Optional courses and specialisation paths lead to some variability in individual student workload, but the overall distribution remains coherent.

The Semester Structure is as follows: Year 1 (Semesters 1 & 2): Foundational courses providing a solid basis across the disciplines of the programme. Year 2, Semester 3: Specialisation pathways (Food Neuroscience, Food & Dietetics, Food & Nutrition) allow students to focus on their chosen track while maintaining a balanced workload of 30 ECTS. Year 2, Semester 4: Internship and Master Thesis (30 ECTS), undertaken either at Lyon 1 or the University of British Columbia.

Overall, the programme's workload distribution is coherent, rational, and sufficient to achieve the intended learning outcomes within the standard two-year timeframe. Internal quality assurance mechanisms support monitoring of workload and progression.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4. Learning Outcomes
- Annex 5. Course syllabi of all partners
- Annex 6. Structure of the Curriculum/Study Plan.

Assessment



Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.

STANDARD 4: ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION

4.1. Admission

The joint Master’s programme has established a structured and comprehensive admission framework, coordinated by a Student Selection Committee with representatives from all full partner institutions. The process is documented in the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), Cooperation Agreement, Annex 7, and the Student Handbook, and includes a dedicated online platform for applications.

According to the Selection Process and Criteria, 60 applicants are initially shortlisted, with a final intake of 30 students per year. The selection Committee is composed of two academic representatives from each partner university to ensure fair representation and compliance with national, regional, and institutional regulations.

The evaluation weighting is as follows: Academic record: 40%; Professional CV: 30%; Special circumstances, awards, publications, experiences abroad, or other achievements: 20%; Personal statement: 10%. The 20% allocated to “special circumstances” and 10% for personal statements are currently not objectively defined, giving the Selection Committee broad discretion. Clearer guidelines and scoring rules would enhance consistency and fairness.

While eligibility includes a range of disciplines (e.g., food science, biology, nutrition, pharmacy, medicine, and development studies), the diversity of backgrounds—particularly degrees in non-scientific areas—may lead to heterogeneous levels of prior knowledge. The programme does not clearly specify academic prerequisites or possible bridging mechanisms for students requiring additional preparation.

The process allows for consideration of special circumstances and diversity, including gender balance, supported by the Equal Opportunities policy. However, the modalities for implementing diversity, inclusiveness, and gender equality considerations are not fully specified.

English language proficiency at C1 level is required, appropriate for the programme’s academic level.

The online platform ensures coordinated evaluation by multiple institutions, enhancing transparency and fairness.



Inconsistent information about tuition fees is provided in the Student Agreement versus the Student Handbook, which may affect applicants' understanding. During the visit, the programme coordinators confirmed that the issue was due to a transcription error.

Overall, the joint admission framework is well structured and generally appropriate for the programme's level and discipline. However, further clarification and formalisation of the evaluation criteria and academic prerequisites, as well as greater transparency regarding fees and diversity quotas, would be beneficial for prospective students.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 2. Cooperation Agreement.
- Annex 8. Official documents related to the procedure for qualifications recognition.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

- Provide clear, objective, and transparent definitions of selection criteria and weighting components, particularly for categories related to additional achievements, special circumstances, and personal statements.
- Clarify the expected applicant profile and academic prerequisites, and ensure consistency of key information provided to applicants.

4.2. Recognition

The recognition of qualifications and periods of study, including prior learning, is aligned with the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Within the consortium, study performances at partner universities are recognised based on learning outcomes, and grade conversion is carried out according to the principles of equivalence established in the Cooperation Agreement for the Joint Master programme.



The recognition process is coordinated by the University of Padova, with final decisions taken by the programme's Academic Board, ensuring joint academic oversight. Annex 8 provides the normative framework governing recognition procedures.

Overall, the recognition framework is well-structured, transparent, and consistent with European standards.

Documentary evidence

-Self Evaluation Report.

-Annex 2. Cooperation Agreement

-Annex 8. Official documents related to the procedure for qualifications recognition.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.

STANDARD 5: LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

5.1. Learning and teaching

Annexes 5 and 6 provide a comprehensive description of the course syllabi, including workload, intended learning outcomes, course contents, teaching and learning methodologies, and assessment methods and criteria. Overall, the curriculum appears carefully designed, and each course seems structured to contribute to the achievement of the programme learning outcomes. This information is also made available to students through the Student Handbook.

The programme proposes a wide range of teaching methodologies and learning activities adapted to the characteristics of each course. These include lectures, participatory and dialogic learning approaches, problem- and project-based learning, challenge-based learning, case studies, flipped classroom activities, design thinking, and collaborative or cooperative learning. Additional formative activities include practical classes, seminars, round-table discussions, work with scientific literature, individual and group projects,



fieldwork, internships in companies and institutions, and laboratory or clinical placements. Field trips and off-site learning activities are also foreseen.

The variety of teaching methods outlined in the course syllabi and summarised in the SER demonstrates an effort to combine passive and active learning approaches in order to facilitate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The competence matrix further illustrates how the programme aims to support the development of transversal and soft skills through these pedagogical approaches.

Programme information, including details on teaching and learning arrangements, is communicated to students through the programme website and the Student Handbook. Monitoring and review mechanisms are planned to evaluate student workload, progression, and satisfaction. It would nevertheless be beneficial to further clarify the operational implementation of some of the innovative teaching approaches mentioned, to better understand how they will be applied in practice and how their contribution to competence acquisition will be evaluated.

Student diversity and individual learning needs are taken into account through institutional support services available at each partner university, coordinated at consortium level through the Joint Secretariat. Inclusion and diversity policies are also referenced, including initiatives linked to the ARQUS European Alliance. Overall, the proposed teaching and learning framework appears adequate to support the achievement of the intended learning outcomes while considering student diversity.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 4 Learning Outcomes
- Annex 5 Course syllabi of all partners
- Annex 6. Structure of the Curriculum/Study Plan.
- Annex 15 Student's Guide.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.



5.2. Assessment of students

The programme proposes a variety of assessment methodologies adapted to the specific characteristics of each course and to the type of learning outcomes being evaluated. These methods are described in the Self-Evaluation Report and assigned to each course in Annex 6, while their application also takes into account the academic regulations of each partner institution, as presented in Annex 9. The overall approach relies on a combination of formative and summative assessment, including written and oral examinations, individual and group deliverables, participation in seminars and debates, projects, tests, self-assessment and peer-assessment activities, as well as evaluation of internships through reports and tutor feedback. The use of continuous evaluation is consistent with current trends in higher education and contributes to monitoring student progress throughout the programme.

Assessment methods appear broadly aligned with the intended learning outcomes and are designed to evaluate knowledge acquisition, competence development, and the application of learning in both academic and professional contexts. Resit opportunities are foreseen, and the allocation of an academic tutor to each student provides an additional mechanism for supporting students during their studies and monitoring their academic progression.

The documentation indicates that assessment procedures will be applied across partner institutions in accordance with their respective regulations, while transparency is supported through the use of grade conversion mechanisms to ensure comparability of results. At the same time, given the existence of three alternative pathways in the third semester, it would be beneficial to further ensure that the level of academic difficulty and assessment expectations across these pathways remain broadly equivalent.

While the course syllabi demonstrate an overall coherent assessment framework, some elements would benefit from further clarification. In several syllabi, learning outcomes are indicated as being verified through “daily participation and continuous evaluation in class” without a clear specification of the corresponding objective assessment criteria, which may reduce transparency. In addition, the procedures and criteria for the assessment of the Master’s thesis are described only in general terms in the documentation and would benefit from a more detailed explanation, including the evaluation criteria, composition of the examination panel, and assessment process. However, overall, the assessment framework appears adequate to evaluate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes within the joint programme.

Documentary evidence

-Self Evaluation Report.



- Annex 5.

- Annex 6.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
	X	

Recommendations:

- Implement mechanisms ensuring that the level of academic difficulty and assessment standards across the three specialisation pathways in the third semester remain broadly equivalent.
- Clarify the assessment framework applied to the Master’s thesis, including the procedures, criteria, and responsibilities for its evaluation, and further develop an explicit framework to support consistency and comparability of student assessment across partner institutions.
- Ensure that assessment methods are fully aligned with intended learning outcomes and that documentation consistently reflects objective criteria and validation procedures.

STANDARD 6: STUDENT SUPPORT

All partner universities in the consortium provide a wide range of student support services, including visa assistance, accommodation support, psychological counselling, buddy programmes, and diversity and inclusion initiatives. These services are designed to support students throughout the programme and to facilitate mobility between institutions. Mobility services assist students in transferring from the University of Padova during the first year to the partner university hosting the third semester, and subsequently to the institution where the fourth semester will be completed. Information on these services is provided in the Student Handbook, although some practical details—particularly those related to visa procedures—still need to be completed. Providing consolidated information through a dedicated online platform would further improve accessibility.

Student support and counselling services are generally adequate to facilitate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. In addition to the Student Handbook, students receive semester-specific Welcome Guides that provide practical information on accommodation, residence permits, banking procedures, campus facilities, public transport connections, and access to health services.



Overall, the student support framework across the consortium institutions appears coherent and sufficiently developed to assist students in managing the academic and practical aspects of mobility within the joint programme. The services offered by the partner universities are well-suited to addressing the specific challenges faced by mobility students and contribute to ensuring smooth academic progression throughout the programme.

However, the documentation does not clearly indicate how students enrolled in the joint programme participate in student representation structures within the partner institutions. As members of the respective universities, joint programme students should have access to appropriate mechanisms for representation in student unions or similar bodies, and the recognition of these rights within the specific legal framework of the joint degree could be clarified.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 13.
- Annex 15.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

- Ensure that all relevant programme information, including practical aspects of mobility and student support services, scholarships, is fully accessible through a dedicated and regularly updated website.

STANDARD 7: RESOURCES

7.1. Academic, administration and services staff

The documentation indicates that the programme is supported by a sufficiently qualified body of academic, administrative, and technical staff across the partner institutions. Annex 10 provides CVs of the main academic staff involved, demonstrating relevant expertise and research activity in the



interdisciplinary fields covered by the programme, as well as experience in international collaboration and teaching in multicultural environments. Overall, the profiles, categories, and experience of the academic staff appear adequate to implement the joint programme. Nevertheless, some inconsistencies in the documentation reduce transparency. In particular, ORCID links are not available or publicly accessible for several staff members, and the distribution of CVs among partner institutions is uneven, with significantly fewer profiles provided for some partners. In addition, the documentation does not clearly indicate which specific courses or modules will be taught by individual staff members, which makes it difficult to fully assess the allocation of teaching responsibilities across the curriculum.

Administrative and services staff appear to be adequately prepared to support the implementation and management of the programme. The governance and management structure is described in the SER, including the coordination framework and the role of the FOOD-H Secretariat. Institutional services such as international offices, IT support, communication units, and student services contribute to the operational functioning of the joint programme. The programme also benefits from the experience of partner institutions in managing international and joint degrees, which supports the feasibility of its implementation.

Overall, the available academic and administrative staff appear sufficient and appropriately qualified to deliver and manage the programme, although clearer documentation regarding staff allocation to specific teaching activities would further enhance transparency.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 2.
- Annex 5.
- Annex 10. Academic Staff CV's.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.



7.2. Facilities and material resources

The facilities and material resources described in section 7.2 of the SER indicate that each partner university provides adequate infrastructure to support the programme. Although there is no specific assignment of particular facilities to individual courses, the overall quantity, quality, and diversity of teaching, laboratory, and social resources appear sufficient to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The consortium offers comprehensive support for both theoretical and practical learning activities, and the available infrastructure is consistent with the interdisciplinary and professional orientation of the programme. Overall, the facilities and resources are considered appropriate for the successful implementation of the joint programme.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 5.
- Annex 15.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		

Recommendations:

None.

STANDARD 8: TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION

The proposal outlines a comprehensive strategy for making relevant programme information publicly available through a dedicated Master's website, which is yet to be created. Once operational, the website will include detailed descriptions of the degree, teaching methodology, curriculum, course guides, assessment and examination procedures, administrative information, Master's Thesis requirements, career opportunities, evaluation and quality assurance processes, admission requirements and



procedures, the Student Agreement, and the Student Handbook. Additional guidance will be provided through partner-specific channels, such as the Master's Coordination Office and International Graduate School, as well as Welcome Guides for incoming students to support mobility and administrative procedures.

The consortium has also developed a broad dissemination strategy to promote the programme globally, leveraging coordinated efforts from all partners, including alumni networks and marketing initiatives. However, care should be taken to avoid references to Erasmus Mundus or Erasmus+ programmes in promotional materials, as the Master is not currently implemented under these frameworks, to prevent sending misleading signals.

Although some information is already available through the University of Padova's public webpage, there are inconsistencies with the officially stated requirements in the Cooperation Agreement, such as the number of admitted students and the required English proficiency level. These discrepancies highlight the need for careful alignment of all publicly available information with the consortium's agreements once the programme website is launched.

Overall, the planned structure for disseminating information is comprehensive and, when fully implemented, should provide prospective and enrolled students with clear, accessible, and accurate guidance on all academic, administrative, and mobility-related aspects of the programme.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.
- Annex 2 Cooperation Agreement
- Annex 6 STRUCTURE OF THE CURRICULUM/STUDY PLAN
- Annex 7 Official documents describing admission requirements and selection procedures
- Annex 8 Official documents related to the procedure for qualifications recognition
- Annex 9 Student's assessment regulations.
- Annex 13 Student Agreement
- Annex 15 Student's Guide

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
X		



Recommendations:

- Ensure that the public website provides complete and up-to-date information fully aligned with the Consortium Agreement, including clear details on admission and recruitment procedures.

STANDARD 9: QUALITY ASSURANCE

The five partner universities each have established internal quality assurance systems, which appear to be well-developed as indicated in the SER and Annex 11, though documentation from Lyon and British Columbia is missing. As a joint programme, the FOOD-H Master requires dedicated joint internal quality assurance procedures to ensure consistent quality and long-term sustainability. Currently, the main joint QA mechanism consists of the FOOD-H Commission, which will design common quality monitoring questionnaires to be administered to all students at the end of each semester. The Commission is responsible for analysing the evaluation results twice a year and proposing measures for implementation in subsequent editions. A student representative is included in the Commission.

The proposed questionnaires will cover multiple aspects, including teaching quality, exercises and lab sessions, study material, examinations, workload, and the adequacy of facilities such as international offices, accommodation, libraries, and IT resources. Additionally, a Graduate Tracking System is planned to monitor alumni employability and career progression, providing feedback that will inform the QA process and be shared with the External Advisory Board (EAB). The EAB is intended as an external quality assurance mechanism, composed of at least three experts from academic institutions, HE specialists, employers, professional practitioners, and representatives from regulatory bodies, although the final composition and expertise are not yet fully defined.

At present, the Consortium relies heavily on local internal QA systems and the limited joint survey, which is insufficient to fully guarantee the quality of the Joint Master. Risk management tools and actions for potential implementation issues are also not clearly defined. While the External Advisory Board adds value, it cannot replace a complete, functioning joint QA system.

Overall, the internal and external QA mechanisms proposed at the joint level, including the Commission, graduate tracking, and EAB, represent a structured framework consistent with EU requirements, but further development and formalisation of a dedicated joint QA body and processes are necessary to ensure effective quality management and sustainability of the programme.

Documentary evidence

- Self Evaluation Report.



-Annex 2.

-Annex 11.

Assessment

Achieved	Partially Achieved	Not Achieved
	X	

Recommendations:

-Establish and implement dedicated internal quality assurance procedures for the programme to monitor and verify the achievement of learning outcomes across all partner institutions. The consortium should establish a specific Quality Assurance body and define a clear plan of activities to ensure the smooth implementation of the Joint Master’s degree. Joint quality assurance procedures should include clearly defined responsibilities, monitoring mechanisms, and reporting processes to oversee and maintain the quality of the programme across partner institutions.

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION PROPOSAL

11.1. Recommendations Summary

STANDARD 1: ELIGIBILITY

1.1. Status

- N/A

1.2. Joint Design and Delivery

- Strengthen the co-design of the programme by incorporating the perspectives of key stakeholders, including students. Students and other stakeholders should be actively and systematically involved in the programme development and review processes.

1.3. Cooperation Agreement

- Further clarify and harmonise selection criteria, mobility arrangements, and assessment procedures (including grading and thesis rules) to enhance transparency, consistency, and joint programme integration.



- The financial framework, including the underlying budget structure, cost-sharing arrangements, and long-term financial sustainability should be described in greater detail to enhance clarity and sustainability.

STANDARD 2: LEARNING OUTCOMES

2.1. Level

- N/A

2.2. Disciplinary field

- Clearly prioritise the primary Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs) addressed by each module, avoiding excessive or systematic mapping to a large number of outcomes.
- Clarify the distinct academic contribution and progressive development of competences within the specialisation pathways, particularly in the Food Neuroscience track, and reduce redundancies in module descriptions and PLO mapping.
- Further articulate the disciplinary positioning, academic depth, and intended graduate profile of the Food Neuroscience pathway to ensure consistency between its denomination and its curriculum content.
- Ensure that highly specialised courses are coherently integrated into the overarching FOOD-H framework and contribute clearly to the overall identity of the joint degree. The consortium could further strengthen the alignment between the three specialisation pathways offered in the third semester and the internship/thesis opportunities available in the fourth semester.
- Make sure all second-year pathways build upon a shared core of competences and collectively lead to a coherent and recognisable graduate profile for the joint programme.

2.3. Achievement

- Finalise and fully implement the Student Handbook, ensuring that it provides complete and consistent information on academic, administrative, support information, and practical arrangements across partner institutions.
- Further specify how the achievement of Programme Learning Outcomes is demonstrated and monitored at joint programme level, ensuring consistency across partner institutions and pathways.
- Clarify the academic implementation and evaluation of the alternance (work-study) option within the joint programme framework.

2.4. Regulated Professions

N/A.

STANDARD 3: STUDY PROGRAMME

3.1. Curriculum

- Review and, where necessary, improve the contents of specific courses or modules, particularly in areas such as food science and technology, to ensure all intended learning outcomes can be fully achieved by students from diverse academic backgrounds.



3.2. Credits

- Clarify the academic status, intended learning outcomes, and workload implications of the non-credited introductory neuroscience module in Path 1 to ensure transparency and proper alignment with the ECTS principles.

3.3. Workload

N/A.

STANDARD 4: ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION

4.1. Admission

- Provide clear, objective, and transparent definitions of selection criteria and weighting components, particularly for categories related to additional achievements, special circumstances, and personal statements.
- Clarify the expected applicant profile and academic prerequisites, and ensure consistency of key information provided to applicants.

4.2. Recognition

N/A.

STANDARD 5: LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

5.1. Learning and teaching

N/A.

5.2. Assessment of students

- Implement mechanisms ensuring that the level of academic difficulty and assessment standards across the three specialisation pathways in the third semester remain broadly equivalent.
- Clarify the assessment framework applied to the Master's thesis, including the procedures, criteria, and responsibilities for its evaluation, and further develop an explicit framework to support consistency and comparability of student assessment across partner institutions.
- Ensure that assessment methods are fully aligned with intended learning outcomes and that documentation consistently reflects objective criteria and validation procedures.

STANDARD 6: STUDENT SUPPORT

- Ensure that all relevant programme information, including practical aspects of mobility and student support services, scholarships, is fully accessible through a dedicated and regularly updated website.

STANDARD 7: RESOURCES

7.1. Academic, administration and services staff



N/A.

7.2. Facilities and material resources

N/A.

STANDARD 8: TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION

- Ensure that the public website provides complete and up-to-date information fully aligned with the Consortium Agreement, including clear details on admission and recruitment procedures.

STANDARD 9: QUALITY ASSURANCE

- Establish and implement dedicated internal quality assurance procedures for the programme to monitor and verify the achievement of learning outcomes across all partner institutions. The consortium should establish a specific Quality Assurance body and define a clear plan of activities to ensure the smooth implementation of the Joint Master’s degree. Joint quality assurance procedures should include clearly defined responsibilities, monitoring mechanisms, and reporting processes to oversee and maintain the quality of the programme across partner institutions.

11.2. The Review Panel Assessment per Standard

STANDARD		ACHIEVED	PARTIALLY ACHIEVED	NOT ACHIEVED
STANDARD 1. ELIGIBILITY	Status	X		
	Joint Design and Delivery	X		
	Cooperation Agreement	X		
STANDARD 2. LEARNING OUTCOMES	Level	X		
	Disciplinary field		X	
	Achievement	X		
	Regulated Professions (if applicable)			
STANDARD 3. STUDY PROGRAMME	Curriculum	X		
	Credits	X		



	Workload	X		
STANDARD 4. ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION	Admission	X		
	Recognition	X		
STANDARD 5. LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT	Learning and Teaching	X		
	Assessment of Students		X	
STANDARD 6. STUDENT SUPPORT		X		
STANDARD 7. RESOURCES	Academic, Administration and Services Staff	X		
	Facilities and material resources	X		
STANDARD 8. TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION		X		
STANDARD 9. QUALITY ASSURANCE			X	

Final evaluation proposal: **FAVOURABLE.**

The panel proposes that a follow-up report shall be submitted to ACCUA by the end of the third year of implementation of the joint programme.



ANNEXES

REVIEW PANEL

Alberto Oleaga is Full Professor of Applied Physics at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU, Bilbao, Spain) as well as Vicedean for Relations with Companies at Bilbao School of Engineering (UPV/EHU). His research interests fall on Applied Physics and Condensed Matter, dealing with thermal, magnetic and magnetocaloric properties of materials of technological interest, mainly for energy applications. He has published about 100 papers in peer reviewed international journals, most of them in collaboration with research groups from all over the world. He has trained many young scientists and engineers, regularly supervising Master and PhD thesis, being the Head of the doctoral programme “Physics” at UPV/EHU. He has experience in university management as former Vicedean for International Relations, coordinator of 4 Erasmus Mundus programmes and Head of the Applied Physics Department, as well as in Quality and Accreditation programmes, both as proposer of Degrees and evaluator in different agencies.

Paola Pittia is Full Professor in Food Science and Technology at the Department of Biosciences and Technology for Food, Agriculture and Environment, University of Teramo. From 2013 to 2024, she served as the Rector's Delegate for Internationalization. Her research expertise is on the design and development, transformation and stabilization of food products, and the quality and technological functionality of food ingredients and biomolecules in formulated systems. She has international expertise in Higher education modernisation and Quality assurance in the field of Food Science and Technology, acquired through Erasmus and Erasmus+ projects as a partner or coordinator. She is/is President of the ISEKI-Food Association (2014-2020, 2023-present) and a member of National association of the Food science and technology (SISTAL). Registered with the Order of Food Technologists professionals since 2001. Since 2015 she has been registered in the Italian Agency for Quality of Higher Education and Research (ANVUR) Register of Evaluators - and has participated in various initial and periodic accreditation visits as a disciplinary and system expert.

Krzysztof Jadczyk is a Student Expert of the Polish Accreditation Committee (PKA), involved in external quality assurance and accreditation procedures in higher education. He is also engaged in institutional quality assurance at the University of Opole as a member of the Committee for Improving the Quality of Education and the Doctoral School Programme Council. He is currently a doctoral candidate in Chemical Sciences and a student of Finance and Accounting at the University of Opole. His interests focus on student-centred learning, quality assurance systems, and the evaluation of higher education programmes in the European Higher Education Area.

Thierry Thomas-Danguin is Senior Research Scientist (Directeur de Recherche, INRAE) at the Centre des Sciences du Goût et de l'Alimentation (CSGA, Dijon, France), where he also serves as Deputy Director of the research centre and co-leads the FFOPP research team. His research focuses on food science and chemical senses, with particular emphasis on flavour perception, multisensory interactions, and food oral processing, exploring the relationships between food structure, sensory perception, and consumer behaviour. He has authored more than 120 peer-reviewed publications and has developed extensive international collaborations. He has supervised numerous PhD and Master's theses and coordinated several national and international research projects including public-private ones. He has significant experience in academic leadership and evaluation, serving on scientific committees, editorial boards of



international journals, and as an expert in the evaluation of research projects (national and European), researchers (INRAE scientific committees), and research units (HCERES).

María Paz Espinosa (Ph D in Economics, Harvard University) is a Professor of Economics at the University of the Basque Country. A significant part of her academic work has focused on Industrial Organization, renewable energy sources, and their integration into electricity markets. Her research has been published in leading academic journals in her field, as well as in edited volumes and monographs. She collaborates with public and private institutions through various research projects and contracts. She has served as President of the Spanish Economic Association and Academic Vice President of the Spanish Association for Energy Economics. She is currently an Honorary Member of the Spanish Economic Association, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Barcelona School of Economics, and a full member of the Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences.



VISIT PROGRAMME

Date: 11 and 13 of March 2026

Joint degree: Joint Master in Food, Nutrition and Health (FOOD-H)

Panel members:

President: Alberto Oleaga Páramo

Secretary: M^a Paz Espinosa Alejos

Academic: Thierry Thomas-Danguin

Professional: Paola Pittia

Student: Krzysztof Jadczyk

The panel will be assisted by technical staff of the Agency.

Type of visit: Online

<https://accua-jda.webex.com/accua-jda/j.php?MTID=m9bc0078b486e59fc594aada6e9fcbff1>

1st Day online site visit. Wednesday, 11 March 2026

Time Duration Activity

09:00-09:30 30 minutes Internal meeting of the panel.

09:30-10:15 45 minutes Meeting with programme coordinators

10:15-10:30 15 minutes Internal meeting of the panel

10:30-11:15 45 minutes Meeting with teaching staff

11:15-11:30 15 minutes Internal meeting of the panel.

11:30-12:15 45 minutes Meeting with students.

12:15-12:30 15 minutes Internal meeting of the panel.

12:30-13:00 30 minutes Meeting with employers/external stakeholders

13:00-13:15 15 minutes Internal meeting of the panel. End of 1st session.

2nd Day online site visit. Friday, 13 March 2026

Time Duration Activity

09:00-09:30 30 minutes Internal meeting of the panel.

09:30-10:00 30 minutes Meeting with consortium coordinators

10:00-10:15 15 minutes Internal meeting of the panel.

10:15-10:45 30 minutes Meeting with students support services



- 10:45-11:00 15 minutes Internal meeting of the panel
- 11:00-11:30 30 minutes Meeting with quality assurance representatives
- 11:30-13:00 90 minutes Internal meeting of the panel.
- 13:00-13:30 30 minutes Final meeting visit conclusions. End of the visit.

LIST OF EVALUATED DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE AND OTHER ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

- Self-Evaluation Report (SER).
- Annexes 1 to 15

THE PRESIDENCY ´S SIGNATURE

**ALBERTO
OLEAGA
PARAMO -
14591577
D** Firmado digitalmente por ALBERTO OLEAGA PARAMO - 14591577D Fecha: 2026.05.11 12:12:27 +02'00'

DATE: of the digital signatures.

THE SECRETARY ´S SIGNATURE

**MARIA PAZ
ESPINOSA
ALEJOS -
22716457R** Firmado digitalmente por MARIA PAZ ESPINOSA ALEJOS - 22716457R Fecha: 2026.05.11 10:24:09 +02'00'



ERRATA SHEET

This report was originally issued and signed on 5 May 2026 with the following erratum:

- Page 2, Executive Summary: The partner institution *Uniwersytet Rolniczy im. Hugona Kołłątaja w Krakowie* was incorrectly referred to as *Jagiellonian University in Kraków (Poland)*. The correct English name is *University of Agriculture in Kraków (Poland)*.