



Agència  
per a la Qualitat  
del Sistema Universitari  
de **Catalunya**

# EX-ANTE ACCREDITATION OF JOINT PROGRAMMES EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT REPORT FOLLOWING THE EUROPEAN APPROACH

**Programme: Master in Global Challenges for Sustainability**

**CHARM-EU – A European University Initiative**

**Universities: University of Barcelona, Trinity College Dublin, Utrecht University, Eötvös Loránd University, University of Montpellier**



# Contents

<b>CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>6</b>
JOINT PROGRAM PRESENTATION .....	6
EXTERNAL PANEL AND REVIEW PROCESS .....	6
<i>Table 1. Composition of the external panel</i> .....	7
<i>Table 2. Provisional site visit program</i> .....	8
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT .....	9
<b>1. ELIGIBILITY</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA .....	11
Rationale: .....	11
Requirements: none .....	12
Recommendations: .....	12
<b>2. LEARNING OUTCOMES</b> .....	<b>13</b>
Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA .....	13
Rationale: .....	14
Requirements: none .....	14
Recommendations: .....	14
<b>3. STUDY PROGRAMME</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Alignment with AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA .....	15
Rationale: .....	15
Requirements: none .....	17
Recommendations: .....	17
<b>4. STUDENT ACCESS AND ADMISSION</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA .....	18
Rationale: .....	18
Requirements: none .....	19
Recommendations: .....	19
<b>5. LEARNING, TEACHING &amp; ASSESSMENT</b> .....	<b>20</b>
Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA .....	20

## DIMENSIONS

<i>Rationale:</i> .....	20
<i>Requirements: none</i> .....	21
<i>Recommendations:</i> .....	21
<b>6. STUDENT SUPPORT .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<i>Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA</i> .....	22
<i>Rationale:</i> .....	22
<i>Requirements: none</i> .....	22
<i>Recommendations: none</i> .....	22
<b>7. RESOURCES .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<i>Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA</i> .....	23
<i>Rationale:</i> .....	23
<i>Requirements: none</i> .....	24
<i>Recommendations: none</i> .....	24
<b>8. TRANSPARENCY &amp; DOCUMENTATION.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<i>Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA</i> .....	25
<i>Rationale:</i> .....	25
<i>Requirements: none</i> .....	25
<i>Recommendations:</i> .....	25
<b>9. QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<i>Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA</i> .....	26
<i>Rationale:</i> .....	26
<i>Requirements: none</i> .....	26
<i>Recommendations: none</i> .....	26
<b>FINAL ASSESSMENT RESULT .....</b>	<b>27</b>



# Introduction

## Joint program presentation

The external review panel should briefly present the joint program providing the necessary context to place the accreditation commission.

The degree program object of accreditation must be identified with its registration data, intake and graduation data from the last available academic year.

The external panel must mark one of the three levels of evaluation according to its evaluation.

### Joint programme identification

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Master in Global Challenges for Sustainability</b>
<b>Coordinating university:</b>	Trinity College Dublin
<b>Partner universities:</b>	University of Barcelona, Utrecht University, Eötvös Loránd University, University of Montpellier
<b>Total ECTS:</b>	90
<b>Vacancies per year:</b>	30-100

## External panel and review process

The external committee must present its composition, the evaluation process that has been followed, including the agenda for the visit.

## DIMENSIONS

Table1. Composition of the external panel

<b>Role</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Area of expertise</b>	<b>Institution</b>
<b>Chair</b>	Lex Lemmens	Transdisciplinarity	Eindhoven University of Technology
<b>Academic</b>	Gilles Trystram	Food	AgroParisTech
<b>Academic</b>	János Józsa	Water	Budapest University of Technology and Economics
<b>Academic</b>	Ildefonso Hernández Aguado	Life & Health	Miguel Hernández University
<b>Student</b>	Pegi Pavletic		ESU
<b>Professional</b>	Jim Clarken	CEO	Oxfam, Ireland
<b>Secretary</b>	Ronny Heintze	International external assessment	AQAS (Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programs in Cologne, Germany)

Table 2. Provisional site visit program

**Day 1. Preparatory panel meeting**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
09:00 – 9:15	Introduction of the panel members
09:15 - 9:45	First impressions.
9:45- 10:00	Pause
10:00 - 11:30	Discussions per standard
11:30 - 11:45	Pause
11:45 - 12:45	Site visit questions
12:45 - 13:00	Pause
13:00 - 13:30	Distribution of work and planning

**Day 2. 1st Day online site visit**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
08:45 – 09:00	Welcome
09:00 - 09:30	Meeting with the consortium program Representatives of the management of the institutions
09:30 - 09:45	Pause
09:45 - 10:45	Meeting with the consortium program. Representatives of the management of the program
10:45 - 11:00	Pause
11:00 - 12:00	Meeting with academic staff (of 3 specialties)
12:00 - 12:15	Pause
12:15 - 13:00	Meeting with employers \ representatives of the work field

**Day 3. 2nd Day online site visit**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
09:15 - 10:15	Premises meetings (meeting to attend concerns regarding necessary resources) Second half of the meeting: mobility
10:15 - 10:30	Pause
10:30 - 11:00	Confirmation meeting with program management to clarify last issues
11:00 - 11:15	Pause
11:15 - 12:15	Internal work of the External Committee (confidential)
12:15 - 12:45	Preliminary conclusions and farewell

Executive summary of the external review report

The external panel must summarize the joint programme strengths and areas for improvement detected because of the external assessment process.

<b>EA Standards</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<b>1. Eligibility</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>2. Learning outcomes</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>3. Study programme</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>4. Admission and recognition</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>5. Learning, teaching and assessment</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>6. Student support</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>7. Resources: Staff and Facilities</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>8. Transparency and documentation</b>	<b>compliant</b>
<b>9. Quality assurance</b>	<b>compliant</b>

## DIMENSIONS

# 1. Eligibility

## 1. Eligibility

1.1. Status: Consortium institutions are recognized as HEIs by their countries. The institutions awarding the degrees ensure that the degrees belong to their respective HE system.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

1.2. Joint design and delivery: The program involves all the Consortium both in the design and in the delivery of the programme

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

1.3. Cooperation agreement: The agreement covers the Denomination, Coordination, Admissions and selection procedures, Mobility of students and teachers as well as Examination regulations, methods and degree awarding procedures.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

Correspondence to [AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA](#)

- Dimension 1 « Programme Description »

The programme name must correspond with its content, it has to be consistent with its discipline and it must not lead to errors about its academic level or effects, or to confusion about its content and professional effects.

### Rationale:

The external review panel positively recognizes that the CHARM-consortium is built of renowned universities in the European higher education area that are all well-established in their national Systems. Within their national frameworks they all offer Master programs in different fields and to different extents. Consequently, the panel is very positive about the legal status of the universities as well as the fitting of a master degree in their respective national systems.

After careful reviewing the cooperation agreement regarding the degree awarding procedures arranged in the consortium, and also discussing this issue with the consortium members, the panel recognizes the complexity of the legal situation the consortium is facing. It is well documented that the regulations foresee the award of a joint degree. At the same time the discussions with the consortium made clear that the

## DIMENSIONS

operational implementation of a joint degree awarding is not yet designed to the very end. However, the consortium agreement very carefully regulates alternative options, assuring an appropriate degree awarding even if the inadequacy of national regulations might prevent the award of a joint degree. The panel commends the consortium for designing complex back-up options that enable the program to run respecting the degree awarding policies of the different universities. While this allows a positive assessment regarding the degree awarding standard, the panel of experts highly encourages the consortium to clarify the operational implementation of awarding a joint degree, as in the interest of students it will be important to know already by the time of application what degree they will be receiving.

The panel also clearly confirms the positioning of the degree and its title, as a Master-program, its title is very clear in that it aims at solving global challenges for sustainability.

After carefully reviewing the self-evaluation report as well as based on the discussions with coordinators of the different institutions it is clear that the program is truly a joint cooperation of the consortium. It is without doubt that the program only comes to live through the cooperative and joint approach of the participating institutions. The diverse strengths of the participating institutions all feed into the program and jointly built its multidisciplinary character. The different pathways available to study also offer flexible learning paths to students and are only enabled by a joint delivery and the participation of all the different universities.

The consortium is built upon a cooperation agreement that covers the relevant aspects. It was available to the experts for review and also subject to discussion with particular focus on the degree awarding procedures during the virtual site visit.

Requirements: none

Recommendations:

The consortium should continue its effort to clarify on the operational implementation of awarding a joint degree in order to create transparency for applicants.

## 2. Learning outcomes

### 2. Learning outcomes

2.1. Level: The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualifications framework(s).

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

2.2. Disciplinary field: The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills, and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

2.3. Achievement: The programme should be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

2.4. Regulated Professions: If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive, should be taken into account.

~~**Compliant**~~

~~**Compliant with conditions**~~

~~**Non-compliant**~~

### Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 3 « Knowledge, skills and competences»

Both the structure and the language used in the formulation of the learning outcomes are relevant, leading to clear and adequate wording. The competence profile is appropriate both to the disciplinary field of the degree and to the level required in EQF and MECES.

## DIMENSIONS

### Rationale:

The consortium defined a list of learning outcomes on the level of the program that was carefully reviewed and discussed by the panel of experts and also during the virtual site visit. Clearly it can be confirmed that these outcomes reflect a master level and are oriented towards Dublin descriptors. The defined competency profile is appropriate for the future working field of graduates.

A particular feature of the program is its multidisciplinary approach and orientation. While this clearly can be seen as an innovative new addition to the academic landscape, it creates the need for clear communication with the outside world particularly about what can be expected as resulting qualification from the master in light of a prior, more disciplinary, entry qualification. The consortium should make sure that there is a clear explanation for the labor market about the specific profile of the graduates. In light of the broad entry qualifications, the consortium might also want to discuss further the role of disciplines in this interdisciplinary program.

The reflection of skills, competencies, and knowledge in the description of the learning outcomes reflect well the interdisciplinary character of the program.

The expert panel carefully discussed the aspect of achievement, as the program is not yet running. Consequently, careful consideration was given to the relation from learning outcomes to the planned curriculum as well as the didactic model with a particular focus on the capstone project in the final part of the curriculum. Also, available learning support mechanisms were considered. As a result, the panel concludes that the planned way of implementing the program enables achievement. An element that should be highlighted from the panels point of view is the great potential for mentorship also by external stakeholders in the program due to its interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approach. The consortium might want to develop existing thoughts in this area even further.

As the program does not qualify for any of the regulated professions, there is no need to particularly address the requirements of the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC. This substandard is not applicable.

Requirements: none

### Recommendations:

The consortium should make sure that there is a clear explanation for the labor market about the specific profile of the graduates.

The consortium should continue to discuss the role of disciplines in this interdisciplinary program.

To support the achievement of the intended outcomes, the role of academic and external stakeholders' mentorship should be further elaborated.

## 3. Study programme

### 3. Study programme

3.1. Curriculum: The structure and content of the curriculum should be fit to enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

3.2. Credits: The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly and the distribution of credits should be clear.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

3.3. Workload: The joint master amounts to 90-120 ECTS. The workload and average time to complete the programme should be monitored.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

Alignment with [AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes](#) ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 5 «Study Programme»

The curriculum is consistent with the intended learning outcomes of the degree. Internal coherence is maintained between the intended learning outcomes and the teaching methods and training and examination activities. The structure of the curriculum allows to carry out all teaching and learning activities and allows adequate dedication of the students. Teaching coordination and supervision mechanisms are clearly defined.

#### Rationale:

The panel carefully studied the different curricular paths that are available to complete the program. On the general level it can be concluded that the designed curriculum supports the achievement of the intended outcome well as there is consistency. An aspect that was a particular subject to discussion was the reflection of the Sustainable Development Goals as well as references to aspects of human rights throughout the curriculum. The discussions with the teaching staff next to the conclusion, that on an implicit level these aspects are well covered why is the need to condense and compromise in the documentation of such a complex program, explicit references to human rights aspects and the SDG's should be considered during the continuous development process of the program.

The content and structure of the program is well thought through. The first phase is designed in such a way that one may expect that almost all students will enter with the same level of knowledge, skills and experiences crucial to this programme. The first modules introduce the topics that are most relevant for this master: sustainability, the idea of social innovation and the third module prepares the students for

## DIMENSIONS

transdisciplinary research. This gives the students the possibility to effectively use the skills and knowledge, first in the area of one of the three theme's presented in the second phase and thereafter in the third phase in the capstone project where they can formulate their own real-world challenge.

The learning outcomes for the program and the different modules are well described. The first three modules - apart from bringing the students the required knowledge- they will teach the students the skills of design thinking, systems thinking, problem solving and communication. Skills that are most relevant for research and design in the area of sustainability. The modules equip the students with a well filled toolkit for dealing with sustainability challenges in a team of people with different disciplines. The modules also deal with research design and methodologies. Every module will be based on the pedagogical approach of challenge-based learning which will activate the students to learn and become the owner of their own learning process.

The panel also carefully discussed the area of policy definition, which is of growing importance in the area of sustainability. Clearly, this area should be further elaborated as part of the future development of the program, which might lead to a refinement of learning outcomes but for sure also impact module content.

Further discussion during the virtual visit interest health theme and its implementation as part of the program. Its current curricular reflection puts a focus on more individual oriented health solutions while non-biomedical but social solutions for health problems or aspects of public health and equity should be further highlighted when further developing the program.

The panel is fully aware that in such a multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary program the curriculum will always have to reflect a compromise resulting from limited credits available to be filled with content. At the same time the panel of experts trusts in the ability of the consortium to keep the required balance while carefully considering what could be reasonable curricular extensions in the before mentioned areas.

Based on the documentation provided, the master program fits in the expected spectrum of ECTS assigned to a master program and the distribution of credits is transparent. This gains special importance, as the different participating universities expect different hours per credit point, which leads to slightly different study times. The panel confirms that there is appropriate transparency and the difference in ECTS and working hours per credit is well documented and does not lead to any imbalances within the program.

In the programme there are two tracks where 90 credits can be realized in 12 or in 18 months. Although the panel is convinced that also the fast track is doable, possible complications of having these two tracks should be monitored, particularly when studies do not progress as planned. The possibility to switch between tracks should be discussed. Impacts of small student cohort groups in the beginning should be considered with regards to adequate group sizes for projects in both tracks.

Existing quality assurance mechanisms as planned by the partners also pay attention to the workload of students which was confirmed during the virtual site visit when discussing quality assurance.

## DIMENSIONS

Requirements: none

### Recommendations:

Human rights and Sustainable Development Goals should be reflected more explicitly in the curriculum.

The design and formulation of policies resulting from the generation of transdisciplinary knowledge should be included in the curriculum in its future development.

Social solutions for health problems or aspects of public health and equity should be further highlighted when further developing the program.

The pros and cons of the two-track system should be monitored.

## 4. Student access and admission

### 4. Admission and Recognition

4.1. Admission: The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in the light of the programme’s level and discipline.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

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

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

### Correspondence to AQU’s Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 4 «Student access and admission»

The access requirements have been correctly defined. The proposal has accessible and adequate information mechanisms prior to enrolment and procedures for welcoming and guiding new students. The planned support and guidance actions for students once enrolled are adequately specified. The criteria and procedures for the transfer and recognition of credits and prior learning experience are clear and adequate.

#### Rationale:

The admission requirements are well defined by the consortium and as straightforward as they are simple. The panel believes that the defined requirements are appropriate for the transdisciplinary master program. Existing regulations for equal opportunities are well-established and are also very much in line with the recruitment of a diverse pool students that in parts will also shape the learning experience as teamwork is an important didactic element in the curriculum, which highlights the need to select students with backgrounds diverse enough to enrich the learning process. Part of the discussion with the consortium during the virtual site visit identified that additional potential already lies in existing good practice at some of the consortium institutions to extend inclusiveness in admission by also targeting e.g., students with children, or students in other specific situations.

An interesting aspect that was subject to discussion during the virtual visit is the regulation that French applicants under certain circumstances have to provide 30 extra credits in order to graduate in the program, which is an interesting particularity of French national regulations. The panel recognizes that the consortium has done what is in its capacity to address this issue. The panel has been reassured that exchange with the French ministry is ongoing and that at this time the key is transparency, which the consortium puts into practice. In light of the standard, the regulation is clear and is fit for the purpose to enable students to access the program, at this point it is just a disadvantage for applicants holding a French passport.

## DIMENSIONS

To access the programme currently a C1 certificate in English language is required. The panel agrees that language proficiency is a prerequisite in order to successfully navigate the program but this proficiency is not in all countries expressed with a C1 certificate. An interesting alternative could be to select students also by using an interview, which would be an alternative way to assess language proficiency and at the same time also consider student motivation as part of the selection process. This would put the focus stronger on language proficiency than on a certified language level.

Considering recognition there is consensus about the need to apply the Lisbon recognition convention which is reflected in the consortium. At the same time the panel agrees that part of the learning success is shaped by the cohort experience and the didactic model of the program that has different phases building on each other. At the same time the panel would like to encourage the consortium to consider extending recognition regulations in the future, particular also with regard to extra qualifications that probably will play a growing role for the addressed target group.

Requirements: none

Recommendations:

Admission regulations should be extended to become even more inclusive, with special attention on inclusivity of vulnerable groups that is currently not a criteria, e.g., for applicants with children, pregnant students, refugees etc.

The consortium might consider adding an interview as part of the selection process in order to also open up to students who do not have a certified C1 level in English while being able to demonstrate language proficiency in an alternative way.

## 5. Learning, Teaching & Assessment

### 5. Learning, Teaching and Assessment

- 5.1. Learning and teaching: The programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve those. The diversity of students and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of the students.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

- 5.2. Assessment of students: The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently among partner institutions.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

### Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 5 «Study Programme»

The curriculum is consistent with the intended learning outcomes of the degree. Internal coherence is maintained between the intended learning outcomes and the teaching methods and training and examination activities. The structure of the curriculum allows to carry out all teaching and learning activities and allows adequate dedication of the students. Teaching coordination and supervision mechanisms are clearly defined.

#### Rationale:

The curriculum outline and its transfer in different teaching and learning modes are important success factors for the program and a decisive part of the study concept. The different study phases with their different approaches, with particular highlights to the capstone project, lead to the conclusion that the methods of teaching and learning are well designed in order to achieve the intended learning outcomes. There is indeed much diversity of the proposed approaches that encourage trans-disciplinarity and in Phase Three probably in a practical rather than theoretical way as proposed in the Phase One course. The capstone project is particularly relevant for interventions by external experts that enrich the teaching portfolio.

The implemented assessment methods are slightly more on the classical side when compared to the overall innovative program, however they are effective when it comes to assessing the achievement of intended outcomes. The panel recognizes that there is indeed lively discussion within the consortium about assessment and its application also in light of consistency across the consortium to guarantee a fair assessment of students. Within the many policies developed within the consortium, it is obvious that at the

## DIMENSIONS

time of the review there is not yet an agreed assessment policy, which would probably be helpful in assuring that there is consistency across the board, also reaching the different teaching staff.

During the interviews the experts also recognized that the innovative approach of the program might cause challenges once the program is rollout and includes different teaching staff that was not involved in development of the program from its beginning. Consequently, the panel recommends considering wider training for teaching staff to familiarize them with the specifics of the program and its innovative approach.

Requirements: none

Recommendations:

The existing approach to assessment of students should be reconfirmed in a shared assessment policy.

Wider training for teaching staff should be implemented to familiarize them with the specifics of the program and its innovative approach.

Within the virtual CHARM-EU Office, students` access to CHARM-EU Institution`s students` ombudsman should be assured , in order to assure that the students have someone to communicate their rights and responsibilities with.

## 6. Student support

### 6. Student support

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning

---

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

---

Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 4 «Student access and admission»

The access requirements have been correctly defined. The proposal has accessible and adequate information mechanisms prior to enrolment and procedures for welcoming and guiding new students. **The planned support and guidance actions for students once enrolled are adequately specified.** The criteria and procedures for the transfer and recognition of credits and prior learning experience are clear and adequate.

Rationale:

The panel found the descriptions in the self-evaluation report regarding the provided orientation programme that is available online for all students and at the local level in all five universities convincing and adequate support for newly enrolled students. Furthermore, the online student's handbook that will be made available to students before the formal commencement of modules outlining course expectations, guidelines, and contact details will be an important instrument to guide and assist students. Also, the Joint Virtual Administrative Office and at the local level the local Administrative Officer will be important points of accessible interaction for students. The panel believes that all these measures combined allow appropriate support in guidance for students.

An area that should be considered in the future as it is not yet fully developed is guidance and counseling regarding financial support mechanisms for students, as well as availability of support for mental health issues for students. Particularly in light of the multiple types of possible and available mobility, both areas should not be overseen as potential areas of further action.

Requirements: none

Recommendations: none

## 7. Resources

### 7. Resources

- 7.1. Staff: The staff should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

- 7.2. Facilities: The facilities provided should be sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

### Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 6 «Academic Staff»

The academic staff is sufficient and appropriate to the number of students and the characteristics of the degree.

The teaching support staff available is also sufficient and appropriate to the number of students and the characteristics of the degree.

- Dimension 7 «Material resources and services»

The material resources and services available at the university and, where appropriate, arranged with other institutions outside the university, (spaces, facilities, laboratories, scientific, technical or artistic equipment, library and reading rooms, new technologies, etc. ), are adequate to the number of students and to guarantee the acquisition of competences and the development of planned training activities, observing the criteria of universal accessibility and design for all.

### Rationale:

The experts panel recognizes the solid foundation of the qualification portfolio available at the participating universities in their highly qualified staff in the required areas for the program. The description in the self-evaluation report as well as the additional information provided shortly before the virtual visit confirms the adequacy of the staff portfolio, particularly in light of qualifications and international experience. One of the areas that was already addressed above is the necessity to train staff with regards to the particularities of the program, when rolling out and including a broader base of teaching staff, that was not involved in the development of the program from the beginning but will contribute to the multidisciplinary portfolio of the program in the future. The many innovative practices that are part of the program will require an on boarding of newly contributing staff.

## DIMENSIONS

In the involvement of practitioners in the teaching offers large potential and to a certain extent already in place. The panel believes that these existing links and contacts to the external, non-academic world could also be used more actively in the continuous development process and design of the program.

Considering resources in the panel considers the presented evidence in the self-evaluation report appropriate and particularly highlights a good implementation of online resources. Database accessibility and access to high-quality labs at the sides of the participating institutions contribute to a good learning environment also with regards to available hardware. The discussions during the virtual site visit also pointed to progressive concepts regarding virtual laboratories that could be made available not just as a replacement during times of pandemic, but also for the future.

Requirements: none

Recommendations: none

## 8. Transparency & Documentation

### 8. Transparency and Documentation

Relevant information about the programme like admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc. should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

---

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

---

#### Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 9 «Quality Assurance system»

The structure and composition of the body or unit in charge of the quality assurance policy is adequate. The procedures for assessing and improving the quality of both teaching and teaching staff respond to established objectives.

**There are procedures for obtaining, analysing and disseminating information on student and teaching staff satisfaction and graduate job placement. That information is used for the assessment and improvement of the degree.**

The criteria and procedures for a possible extinction of the degree have been defined.

#### Rationale:

The panel can confirm that there is a very clear plan on how to transparently communicate and make available relevant information. Information about the Master's programme including aim and structure, module information, professors, admission and assessment requirements, criteria and procedures will be documented on the programme web site, which will also be optimized for mobile viewing. Course information will be available in all Alliance course catalogues and websites. Because of its interesting mix of online and presence also presented in teaching and learning, a key source of information will be based on digital platforms and be available online. The panel believes that this is an appropriate approach which also respects the needs of mobile students.

Requirements: none

#### Recommendations:

The consortium should Work on the development of micro credentials recognition system in order to support students` extracurricular activities and allow a more personalized learning approach.

## 9. Quality assurance system

### 9. Quality Assurance

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.

---

**Compliant**

**Compliant with conditions**

**Non-compliant**

---

#### Correspondence to AQU's Guide for Joint Programmes ex-ante accreditation using the EA

- Dimension 9 «Quality Assurance»

The structure and composition of the body or unit in charge of the quality assurance policy is adequate. The procedures for assessing and improving the quality of both teaching and teaching staff respond to established objectives.

There are procedures for obtaining, analysing and disseminating information on student and teaching staff satisfaction and graduate job placement. That information is used for the assessment and improvement of the degree.

The criteria and procedures for a possible extinction of the degree have been defined.

#### Rationale:

The description in the self-evaluation report regarding quality assurance mechanisms are well-established, vigorous and clear. The implemented procedures built on the experiences and structures of the five participating institutions. The academic board, which consists of representative of all participating institutions, has a particularly strong role, when it comes to supervision, implementation, and also further development of the policies of the consortium. The panel believes that it is particularly important to highlight that this central body is a body that is jointly staffed by all institutions. An additional examination board takes responsibility for the implementation of examinations and respective policies. Initially the panel questioned the implementation of The Rectors Assembly as the highest governing authority but found very convincing reasoning during the virtual site visit, that due to the programmatic integration of the Master in CHARM EU this is a well thought structure. An addendum to the cooperation agreements and regulates specifics regarding quality assurance in sections two and six, which was carefully reviewed by the expert panel and gave no reasons for concern or required adjustments.

Requirements: none

Recommendations: none

## Final assessment result

The external review panel should briefly present the summary of the assessment as a result of the analysis of the evidence and of the information collected during the visit to assess the joint Master in Global Challenges for Sustainability.

<b>Dimensions:</b>	<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Correspondence with AQU's standards</b>
1. Eligibility: Status, Joint design and delivery, cooperation agreement	compliant	1. Programme Description
2. Learning outcomes: Level, Disciplinary field, Achievement	compliant	3. Knowledge, skills & competencies
3. Study programme: Curriculum, Credits, Workload	compliant	5. Study programme
4. Admission and recognition: Admission, Recognition of prior learning	compliant	4. Students, access & admissions
5. Learning, teaching and assessment	compliant	5. Study programme
6. Student support	compliant	4. Students, access & admissions
7. Resources: staff & facilities	compliant	6. Academic staff. 7. Material resources
8. Transparency and documentation	compliant	9. QA system
9. Quality assurance	compliant	9. QA system

## FINAL ASSESSMENT

## DIMENSIONS

This External assessment committee recommends to the Institutional and Programme Review Commission of AQU Catalunya the favourable ex-accreditation of the program evaluated with the level of "Compliant"

The Chair of the external evaluation committee states that this document constitutes the assessment report.

President's name

*P. M. C. Lammens*

City, date

*Eindhoven, 15-12-2020*

*P. M. C. Lammens*

Agència per a la Qualitat del Sistema Universitari de Catalunya

October 2020



Agència  
per a la Qualitat  
del Sistema Universitari  
de **Catalunya**



[www.aqu.cat](http://www.aqu.cat)



@aqucatalunya