



Assessment report: European Master of Law and Economics

Copyright © 2013 by the **European Consortium for Accreditation in higher education**

Author: Axel Aerden

*All rights reserved. This information may be used freely and copied
for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is acknowledged
(© European Consortium for Accreditation).*

*Additional copies of this publication are available
via www.eacaconsortium.net.*



Table of content

1. Introduction	7
2. General overview	9
2.1. Overview of the joint programme	9
2.2. Overview of the consortium	10
2.3. Overview of relevant external quality assurance	12
3. Assessment criteria.....	14
Standard 1. General conditions.....	14
Standard 2. Intended learning outcomes	18
Standard 3. Programme	20
Standard 4. Internal quality assurance system	23
Standard 5. Facilities and student support	26
Standard 6. Teaching and learning.....	28
Standard 7. National components (per country)	31
4. Executive summary.....	36
Annex 1: Composition of the assessment panel	39
Annex 2: Statements of Independence	41
Annex 3: Documents reviewed	42
Annex 4: Site visit programme	43
Overview	43
Programme	43

1. Introduction

This report is the result of the assessment of the European Master of Law and Economics coordinated by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO). This assessment procedure took place within the framework of the JOQAR project¹. The overall purpose of this project is to ensure that Erasmus Mundus programmes (and joint programmes in general) are facilitated in two specific areas: accreditation and recognition. Regarding accreditation, the project's aim is to simplify external assessments by organising single accreditation procedures that can lead to formal accreditation decisions in all relevant countries.

The assessment procedure was organised as laid down in the Assessment Framework for Joint Programmes² agreed among the members of the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA).

A panel of experts was convened by NVAO. The assessment panel consisted of the following members:

- Dr. Nick Harris, panel chair, former Director Development and Enhancement Group, Quality Assurance Agency (United Kingdom)
- Prof. Dr. Roberto Pardolesi, Director Law & Economics LAB, LUISS Guido Carli (Italy)
- Prof. Jean-Yves Art, Associate General Counsel at Microsoft (Belgium)
- Ieva Baltiņa, student European Studies, University of Latvia (Latvia)

The composition of the panel reflects the expertise deemed necessary by the Assessment Framework. The individual panel members' expertise and experience can be found in [Annex 1: Composition of the assessment panel](#). All panel members signed a statement of independence and confidentiality. These signed statements are included in [Annex 2:](#)

¹ <http://www.eaconsortium.net/main/projects/joqar>

² At time of writing, this framework was not available publicly.

[Statements of Independence](#). The procedure was coordinated by Axel Aerden, senior international policy advisor at NVAO.

The assessment panel studied the self-evaluation report and annexed documentation provided by the programme before the site visit. ([Annex 3: Documents reviewed](#)) The panel organised a preparatory meeting the day before the site visit. The site visit took place on 15 March 2013 at Hamburg University. ([Annex 4: Site visit programme](#))

The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per standards immediately after the site visit. These were based on the findings of the site visit, and building on the assessment of the self-evaluation report and annexed documentation.

The draft version of this report was finalised taking into account the available information and relevant findings of the assessment. Where necessary the panel corrected and amended the report. The panel finalised the draft report on 15 April 2013. The programme was then asked to supply missing information regarding some of the national components. This information was received on 21 May 2013. The panel approved the final version of the report on 30 May 2013.

2. General overview

2.1. Overview of the joint programme

- Name(s) of the qualification: European Master in Law and Economics (LL.M)
 - Number of credits: 60 ECTS
 - Specialisations (if any): -
 - ISCED field(s) of study: 3 Social sciences, business and law
31 Social and behavioural science
38 Law
- Locations: Aix-en-Provence, Bologna, Ghent, Haifa,
Hamburg, Mumbai, Rotterdam, Vienna, Warsaw

Table 1. Official qualifications awarded by partner institutions

Partner institution	Awarded qualification
Erasmus University Rotterdam	European Master in Law and Economics (LL.M.)
Ghent University	European Master in Law and Economics
Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research	Master of Science in Law and Economics
University of Aix/Marseille	Master in Business, Law and Economics
University of Bologna	European Master in Law and Economics
University of Haifa	Master of Laws
University of Hamburg	LL.M. (European Master in Law and Economics)
University of Vienna	Master of Arts MA (European Master in Law and Economics)
Warsaw School of Economics	Magister na kierunku Ekonomiczna Analiza Prawa

2.2. Overview of the consortium

- Partners in the consortium:
 - University of Bologna (Italy),
 - Erasmus University Rotterdam (the Netherlands),
 - University of Hamburg (Germany),
 - Ghent University (Belgium),
 - Aix/Marseille University (France),
 - University of Vienna (Austria),
 - Warsaw School of Economics (Poland),
 - University of Haifa (Israel) and
 - Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research in Mumbai (India)

Table 2. Formal overview of the partner institutions

Full original name (translation in English)	Legal Status	Type	Location	Country
Aix-Marseille Université (University of Aix/Marseille)	Public	HEI	Aix-en-Provence	France
Alma Mater Studiorum, Università di Bologna (University of Bologna)	Public	HEI	Bologna	Italy
Universiteit Gent (Ghent University)	Public	HEI	Ghent	Belgium
Oniversitat Haifa (University of Haifa)	Public	HEI	Haifa	Israel
Universität Hamburg (University of Hamburg)	Public	HEI	Hamburg	Germany
Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research	Public	HEI	Mumbai	India
Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (Erasmus University Rotterdam)	Public	HEI	Rotterdam	Netherlands
Universität Wien (University of Vienna)	Public	HEI	Vienna	Austria
Szkoła Główna Handlowa w Warszawie (Warsaw School of Economics)	Public	HEI	Warsaw	Poland

The partners award a multiple degree based on the institutions where a student has studied.

Table 3. Formal tasks with the joint programme consortium

Partner institution	Formal task (function)
Erasmus University Rotterdam	Erasmus Mundus Coordinating University - external affairs - admission & pre-selection non-European students - mobility of teachers and researchers - distribution Erasmus Mundus scholarships (Erasmus Mundus Coordinator: prof. Alessio Paccès; Erasmus Mundus Assistant Coordinator: Wicher Schreuders)
Ghent University	Internal Quality Assurance (Quality Assurance Officer: prof. Ben Depoorter)
University of Hamburg	EMLE Coordinating Centre - internal affairs - admission & pre-selection European students - mobility of students over the terms - financial organisation (Programme director: prof. Thomas Eger)
University of Vienna	EMLE Ombudsservice (Ombudsman: prof. Wolfgang Weigel)

Table 4. Activity of the partner institutions in the curriculum

Partner institution	Teaching term #1	Teaching term #2	Term #3 & thesis
University of Aix/Marseille			X
University of Bologna	X	X	
Ghent University		X	
University of Haifa			X
University of Hamburg	X	X	X
Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research			X
Erasmus University Rotterdam	X		X
University of Vienna			X
Warsaw School of Economics			X

2.3. Overview of relevant external quality assurance

Partner	Competent QA agency	Status	Period of validity
Aix/Marseille	-	Recognised (under French law)	Until October 2017
Bologna	-	Recognised (under Italian law)	Without expiration
Ghent	NVAO	Accreditation	Until September 2016
Haifa	CHE ³	Recognised (under Israeli law)	Without expiration
Hamburg	ZEVA ⁴	-Accreditation -Recognised (under Hamburg State law)	Until 30 September 2015 (ZEVA) -Without expiration
Mumbai	NAAC ⁵	Recognised (under Indian law)	Without expiration
Rotterdam	NVAO	Accreditation	Until 22 August 2016

³ Council for Higher Education, <http://che.org.il/>

⁴ Zentrale Evaluations- und Akkreditierungs- agentur Hannover. www.zeva.org

⁵ National Assessment and Accreditation Council, www.naac.gov.in

Vienna	-	Recognised (under Austrian law)	Without expiration
Warsaw	-	Recognised (by Ministerial decision)	Without expiration

3. Assessment criteria

The panel was required to assess on a four-point scale as included in the assessment framework. In its preparatory meeting the panel agreed on the following definitions for this scale:

Unsatisfactory	The programme does not meet the this standard and shows identifiable shortcomings.
Satisfactory	The programme meets this standard and shows an acceptable level across the standard's entire spectrum.
Good	The programme systematically surpasses this standard across the standard's entire spectrum.
Excellent	The programme systematically and substantially surpasses this standard across the standard's entire spectrum and - for this standard- it can be regarded as an international example. (Here, the panel can explicitly identify an exemplary practice.)

Standard 1. General conditions

Criterion 1a: Recognition

The institutions in the consortium are legally recognised as higher education institutions and their respective national legal frameworks allow them to participate in this joint programme.

If the joint programme awards a joint degree then this should be in accordance with the legislation governing the awarding institutions.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report includes an overview of the legal status of each institution. From reviewing the national legal frameworks it is clear that these frameworks allow these institutions to participate in joint programmes. The programme does not award a joint degree. The multiple degrees awarded only include degrees from the institutions where a student has actually studied.

The EMLE programme was recognised as an Erasmus Mundus Master's Course (EMMC).

This recognition procedure by the Executive Agency for Education, Audiovisual and Culture

(EACEA) of the European Commission includes the appropriate agreement from the competent national authorities.

During the site visit, the panel found that the programme is cautious in introducing an EMLE joint degree. The panel found that this cautiousness was inspired by the programme's thoughtful approach to the legal frameworks in which they operate.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that all partners in the EMLE Consortium are legally recognised higher education institutions and that their respective national legal frameworks allow these institutions to participate in this joint programme.

Criterion 1b: Cooperation agreement

It is clear from both the cooperation agreement and the subsequent implementation that the partners in the consortium agree on the following points:

- Overall coordination of the programme and/or sharing of responsibilities;
- Admission and selection procedures for students;
- Mobility of students and teachers;
- Examination regulations, student assessment and recognition of credits in the consortium;
- Type of degree (joint, multiple) and awarding modalities;
- Teaching language(s);
- Coordination and responsibilities regarding internal quality assurance;
- Administration of student's data and performance records;
- Support for student mobility;
- Public information on the programme;
- Financial organisation (including sharing of costs and incomes, charging registration and/or tuition fees, grants and fellowships);
- Change in partnership.

Findings:

The Self-evaluation report includes the *Consortium Agreement Concerning the Implementation of the Programme: 'European Master in Law and Economics' (EMLE)*. This agreement is signed by the competent authorities (rectors, presidents, etc.) of each of the partner institutions. This cooperation agreement replaces the previous agreement of 2003. The panel found the Consortium Agreement to be of considerable size. The following points are explicitly addressed in the Consortium Agreement:

- Programme description (Section B).
This description outlines the goals of the programme, quality, integrated structure, learning outcomes and career development;
- Governance of the consortium (Section C).
This section outlines in detail the management structure, the governing bodies and the role of these bodies within the consortium;
- Educational responsibilities (Section D)
This section explicitly identifies each of the partners' responsibilities in the

- structure, the quality and the outcomes of the programme. This includes statements regarding the amount of administrative and teaching staff.
- Programme management (Section E)
This section outlines in detail the admission criteria, the application procedure, the organisation of visiting scholars, the examination criteria, degree awarding, the diploma supplement, the graduation ceremony and the mid-term meeting.
- Financial management (Section F)
This section outlines in detail the tuition fees (amount and collection), income distribution, payment to partners and payment of scholarships.
- Quality assurance (Section G)
This section outlines how the internal quality assurance system organised within the structures outlined in Section C, D and E functions, responsibilities regarding external quality assurance and the establishment of an ombudsman.
- Services for Students and Scholars (Section H)
This section outlines the facilities and insurances, the language policy, the student and scholarship agreements, the networking and the alumni.
- Relationships with stakeholders (Section I)
This section outlines the aims of these relationships, the EMLE Advisory Committee, the involvement of Associate Members, the internships and work placements, and the financial contributions.
- Modification and termination (Section J)
This section outlines how the consortium deals with both non-minor and minor modifications, with any change in composition of the partnership and with any change in the role of a partner. In addition, it formulates the competent court in case of legal disputes.

The Consortium Agreement further includes six annexes. These annexes include the EMLE learning outcomes, the EMLE programme structure, the EMLE curriculum and synopsis of courses, the EMLE student agreement, the EMLE thesis & exam regulations and the Scholarship Agreement.

The panel found no dedicated entry on Public information on the programme as mentioned in the standard. It did find explicit mention of the EMLE website under the responsibilities of the Director and the Erasmus Mundus Coordinator (Section C. Governance of the consortium). The Director maintains the EMLE website (www.emle.org), making sure that it always provides updated information about the Programme from the academic, financial, and administrative point of view. The EM Coordinator monitors compliance of the EMLE communication with EM requirements and updates the pages of the EMLE Websites relating to the EM scholarships and to the application by Non-European students.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that from both the cooperation agreement and its subsequent implementation that the partners in the consortium agree on the points included in standard 1b.

Criterion 1c: Added value

The programme can demonstrate the added value of offering this joint programme in international perspective.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report puts forward three major added values of this joint programme:

1. The first added value is the international student group. The participation of European and non-European students makes it possible to engage the student group in comparing different rules and evaluate alternative legal solutions in various countries using an economic methodology;
2. The second added value is cultural. The joint programme enables students to familiarise themselves with each other's cultures and languages in different legal and economic environments in Europe.
3. The third added value is specialisation. The strengths of individual consortium partners are used to offer focused courses and offer specialised thesis supervision. The self-evaluation report here adds that this type of specialisation is not possible in a programme offered nationally or by a smaller consortium.

The panel indeed found an international student group. Both the students and the alumni interviewed by the panel agreed that this part of the programme was not just enjoyable but an inherent part of the programme itself. They agreed that the programme encouraged them to bring in national and regional perspectives. In addition, the alumni claimed the programme made them culturally competent.

Regarding the value of specialisation, the panel asked the management of the programme why the partnership does not include any US institutions. The response was clear: tuition fees. EMLE has therefore implemented a light cooperation with US institutions, such as the Law and Economics Center at the University of California at Berkeley. In addition, there are structural problems. A US institution's third term ends in May when the EMLE programme is in the middle of its third term.

The panel agrees that as a result of these added values, the EMLE programme has developed its own unique selling position worldwide. The problem perceived by the panel is the fact that the labour-market seems blissfully unaware of it, but this does not undermine the joint programme's added value in any way.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme can demonstrate the added value of offering this joint programme in international perspective. Although this is not actually an issue of concern under this standard, the panel does feel that the programme should be better communicated ("marketed") to the labour-market and the professional field.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 1. General conditions

The panel has found a well-established programme organised for over twenty years. The partnership has well-documented its cooperation and the panel found that all the underlying criteria of this standard were systematically surpassed. The programme's approach to the legal frameworks in which it operates, the comprehensiveness of the cooperation agreement and the self-reflective attitude towards its added value convinces

the panel that these aspects of the programme can be regarded as an international example. The panel therefore assesses *Standard 1. General conditions* as excellent.

Standard 2. Intended learning outcomes

Criterion 2a: Shared

The intended learning outcomes are developed and shared by all partners.

Findings:

The Consortium Agreement refers to the general learning outcomes in Section B. The panel found that the learning outcomes themselves are further elaborated in an annex to the Consortium Agreement and thus signed by all competent authorities of the partner institutions. The self-evaluation report explains that these learning outcomes are the results of consortium internal discussions and discussions with the representatives of the students, the alumni and the labour market when the first phase of Erasmus Mundus recognition came to an end. The consortium applied for a renewal of their Erasmus Mundus recognition in 2009 with the current set of intended learning outcomes. The self-evaluation report adds that these learning outcomes are discussed with representatives of the students, the alumni and the labour market during the evaluations of the programme.

During the site visit, the panel asked the management, the students, and the alumni about the aims of the programme as put forward by these learning outcomes and found that they were not questioned. Most responses immediately referred to the actual implementation of these learning outcomes. The panel therefore wanted to learn whether the learning outcomes drive the partnership or whether the partnership drives the learning outcomes. The management's response was quite clear: the overall mission of the programme defines the partnership and therefore drives the selection of the partners.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are developed and shared by all partners.

Criterion 2b: Level

The intended learning outcomes align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (the so-called Dublin descriptors) or the European Qualifications Framework.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report outlines the goal of the EMLE programme as to provide students with advanced knowledge in Law and Economics, thus implying significantly more than training students in law and in economics. The panel agrees that the intended learning outcomes indicate that students will be trained to perform the Economic Analysis of Law. The self-evaluation report also outlines the aim of the EMLE programme as to provide students with advanced knowledge in Law and Economics. Advanced knowledge is made

concrete by specifying that the programme's graduates will be able to perform scientific research in interdisciplinary research teams.

In addition to the goal and the aim, the self-evaluation report links the programme's learning outcomes to knowledge, skills and attitude areas as delineated in the Dublin descriptors.

The panel has related EMLE's intended learning outcomes to these Dublin descriptors and found that some individual descriptors could actually refer to bachelor's level. Overall though, it is clear from the combination of descriptors that these intended learning outcomes clearly indicate master's level for the panel. Recognising that the programme attracts graduates with significantly different backgrounds, it is designed to lead students through progressive series of intended learning outcomes and ensure that, irrespective of their entry background, they all have the opportunity to attain the necessary level for a common master's degree.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that EMLE's intended learning outcomes align with master's level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (the so-called Dublin descriptors).

Criterion 2c: Subject/discipline

The intended learning outcomes comply with the requirements in the subject/discipline and, where applicable, the professional field.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report puts forward that the EMLE programme aims to develop general competences and general academic-oriented competences at an advanced level, which here should be interpreted as master's level, as well as to develop an advanced understanding of and insight into academic-disciplinary knowledge, which is law and economics. Here, the panel focuses on disciplinary knowledge. The programme puts forward that it follows the newest developments and incorporates these into the lectures. As examples the programme refers to relatively new developments: behavioural law and economics, law and economics of transition, and law and economics of development. The panel also looked closely at the intended learning outcomes from the perspective of students coming in with either a legal or an economic background. The panel agrees here that the intended learning outcomes aim to convince lawyers to understand economic concepts to better understand law and to convince economists to understand legal concepts to better understand economical issue. The question whether these learning outcomes are in line with the disciplinary law and economics requirements, is answered with a definite yes from the panel.

The original disciplinary background and the specialisations within the programme create a diverse set of graduates. Since there is no, and probably cannot be, a common labour-market for all EMLE's graduates, the panel wanted to know from the programme how they identified the requirements from the professional field. The teaching staff interviewed were clear that they had found that employers wanted a ready-made package, something the programme does not want to offer. Both the management and the teaching staff presented examples of how the programme structurally and coherently links the

programme to the professional field. Both specifically referred to the relationships with the EMLE alumni and the institutions they work for and to the Associated Members. These EMLE members include local and international law firms, NGOs, private companies, and public bodies. The Associated Members are also represented in EMLE’s Advisory Committee. As described under criterion 2a, these Associated Members have thus also been involved in the evaluation of the previous set of learning outcomes.

The panel agrees there is clear value in the programme’s broader approach as presented through its learning outcomes. There is indeed labour-market value for these graduates with these learning outcomes. The panel agrees that this labour-market is not the same as for graduates of for example competition law. Graduates who have acquired EMLE’s learning outcomes have a wider, more eclectic base of information and approaches on which to draw subsequently. The panel considers this programme for example excellent for the law makers of the future. The panel thus agrees the intended learning outcomes comply with requirements from the broad professional field. Additionally however, the panel also perceives a certain disconnect between the programme and employment; something the programme is apparently also aware of, given their efforts (e.g. year books with graduate’s CVs for employers, alumni career monitoring, etc.) in this area. Some of EMLE’s graduates are not appropriately hired for their law and economics background but the panel here feels the programme cannot be held responsible for market failure.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme’s intended learning outcomes comply with the requirements of the law and economics discipline and with the requirements from the professional field.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 2. Learning outcomes

The panel has found a programme that has a tradition of developing and evaluating learning outcomes. The partnership has substantiated its intended learning outcomes well and the panel found that all the underlying criteria of this standard were systematically surpassed. The programme’s approach to include all stakeholders in not only continuing its development but also evaluating its learning outcomes, and the structural and coherent involvement of the professional field convinces the panel that these aspects of the programme can be regarded as an international example. The panel therefore assesses *Standard 2. Learning Outcomes* as excellent.

Standard 3. Programme

Criterion 3a: Admission

The admission criteria and selection procedures are in line with the joint programme’s level and discipline.

Findings:

According to the self-evaluation report, only applicants who have the first “job qualifying degree” in their field can be admitted to the EMLE. This refers to the aspect of

employability included in the first cycle Dublin descriptors or the descriptors for Bachelor's level in the European Higher Education Area. The panel here found a precise description of corresponding degrees. The self-evaluation report further point out that in the legal profession (e.g. judge, attorney, prosecutor), stricter qualifying criteria (first master degree, Staatsexamen, bar exam) may be required by national regulations. In addition, the programme gives preference to applicants who have already a first master's degree. During the site visit, the panel found that most students indeed already had a master's degree.

Due to the nature of the programme, it attracts students with quite distinct backgrounds. The panel found that the admission criteria and selection procedure have been set up to accommodate different disciplinary and national backgrounds. Both the procedure and the criteria were found to be well-documented and the panel found no issue here.

Not an actual part of the selection procedure but intrinsically connected is the programme's aim to create a level playing field for all incoming students by offering introductory courses. Under the next criterion, the panel will look further at the programme's recipe for dealing with different disciplinary backgrounds of incoming students.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the admission criteria and selection procedures are in line with the joint programme's level and discipline.

Criterion 3b: Structure

The structure and content of the curriculum and its pedagogical approach correspond with the intended learning outcomes.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report outlines the programme as a curriculum of 60 credits divided in three terms of 20 credits: October-December, January-March and April-June/July. The thesis can be submitted until mid-August. The courses offered in the first and second term are each offered by three different universities. All the partner universities, except the University of Bologna and Ghent University, offer the third term. This is intended to ensure a wide range of specialization and to provide individual supervision for the thesis work. The self-evaluation report does refer to the programme's pedagogical approach but in addition states that pedagogical styles differ per location. This is not considered an issue by the partnership since the course contents are harmonised across partners, including student assessments. During the site visit, the teaching staff was asked to explain in detail the programme's pedagogical approach. The approach in the first term can be described as didactic teaching and with students preparing papers. The aim here is to bring students to a position where they all have at the least the minimum requisite knowledge across all of the fields required for the rest of the programme. The second term offers a graduate school experience where the focus is on the integration of knowledge, with an increasing focus on seminars. The programme finishes of in third term with an integrated approach to application and conceptual thinking (moot courts etc.). This pattern was confirmed to the panel by students and alumni. The panel considers this pedagogical approach quite appropriate.

The programme explained the concept of the curriculum both in the self-evaluation report and during the site visit. Initially, courses in the curriculum are about the meaning of economic concepts used in different fields of law. The focus in the curriculum then moves to using economic insights in solving real-life cases in various fields of the law. And finally, the emphasis in the curriculum shifts to the use of the scientific capabilities and research methodology, especially in writing the master thesis.

The panel appreciates the programme’s approach in developing such a complicated programme, which incorporates so many different perspectives and even clashing disciplinary opinions.

As presented under criterion 3a, the programme attracts students with quite distinct backgrounds. The panel therefore looked more closely at the issue of depth and breadth in the curriculum. This is indeed a complex issue. The panel found that the programme’s strategy is to reach master's level for all students with all backgrounds at the end of first term. The programme agrees that the first term is therefore considered a compromise and they are fully aware that this approach can only work if the programme's admission criteria are strictly enforced.

The panel looked more in detail at how and whether the programme actually manages this strategy. The curriculum indeed offers more sophistication to the students and thus more economics for lawyers and more legal issues for economists. The panel did find the course on competition law and economics limited. This is the most traditional field where law and economics entangle and then the current course is perhaps not sufficient. The programme agreed with that observation but they on the other hand perceive the curriculum as very balanced. Tweaking one course could undermine the whole programme. The teaching staff had, for example, also discussed a crash course in statistics but considered that this would be too abstract for their student body. The programme explained this conclusion from their need to demonstrate direct relevance when teaching quantitative methods.

During the site visit, the students and alumni agreed the first term was a compromise but they felt that by the second term they all shared a common basis for their further studies. The panel explicitly asked students and alumni who already had a master's degree before they were admitted to the EMLE programme and whether they considered the overall curriculum fit for master's level. Both groups agreed that this was certainly the case.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the structure and content of the EMLE programme’s curriculum and its pedagogical approach correspond with their intended learning outcomes.

According to the panel, the programme certainly achieves its idea to present the ‘state of the art’ in Law and Economics. This is something the panel considers quite an impressive achievement by the consortium partners.

Criterion 3c: Credits

The distribution of credits is clear.

Findings:

As described above, the self-evaluation report outlines the programme as a curriculum of 60 credits divided in three terms of 20 credits. The first and second term consist of four

modules which each take exactly five credits. The third term consists of a thesis of 15 credits and a module of two courses of each 2.5 credits.

During the site visit, the panel asked both the management and the teaching staff how this distribution came about. From both groups the panel has clearly understood that this distribution of credits reflects the programme's view. For the programme all elements are as important and therefore the workload and learning outcomes to achieve (crystallised in credits) is spread evenly across the curriculum.

In addition, the programme uses an EMLE ECTS Grading Table based on the results of the previous five years. This table includes the EMLE term exam grades (with an interval of 0.5), the grading percentage and the cumulative percentage.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the distribution of credits is clear.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 3. Programme

The panel has found a programme with a substantial history. The partnership offers a well-established programme and the panel found that all the underlying criteria of this standard were systematically surpassed. The programme has well-documented its selection procedure and criteria in which different disciplinary and national backgrounds are accommodated, the curriculum more than appropriately incorporates many different perspectives and clashing disciplinary opinions and the credit distribution is appropriately matched by a grading table. The panel is convinced that these aspects of the programme can be regarded as an exemplary practice. The panel therefore assesses *Standard 3. Programme* as excellent.

Standard 4. Internal quality assurance system

Criterion 4a: Common understanding

There is a common understanding of the internal quality assurance system for this joint programme in which responsibilities are clearly shared and coordinated.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report outlines the responsibilities within the consortium regarding internal quality assurance. The panel found these responsibilities also outlined in the consortium's Cooperation Agreement. To summarise, the Board is responsible for the quality assurance of the programme as a whole. In addition, there is a Quality Assurance Officer which is responsible for getting feedback from stakeholders and for presenting outcomes at Board meetings (February, October) and/or at the Teachers Summer meeting (June/July). The Quality Assurance Officer also chairs the Quality Assurance Committee which collects and discusses complaints, criticisms and suggestions from the students. The students furthermore elect student representatives at each partner university both in first and second term.

The panel found the programme succeeded in well-documenting their organisation and procedures. It is clear to the panel that the partnership has committed a lot of work into

establishing a common understanding for internal quality assurance. The programme succeeded in creating what the panel would commendably refer to as a “bureaucratic red carpet”. The self-evaluation report showcases the programme’s experience in gathering and outlining information, although it does not really include actual self-evaluation. During the site visit, the panel therefore looked for self-evaluation and self-criticism and found the programme to be very self-reflective. Neither the management nor the teaching staff were afraid to present and discuss internal debates and issues in an open manner. Interestingly, the teaching staff referred to the programme’s well-documented approach as real integration and coordination. Here they agreed that things were less spontaneous than they used to be but that they considered this evolutionary fitness for purpose.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme has a common understanding of its internal quality assurance system and that responsibilities are clearly shared and coordinated.

Criterion 4b: Stakeholder involvement

The stakeholders (students, staff, employers, graduates, etc.) are involved in the internal quality assurance activities (including graduate surveys and employability issues).

Findings:

The self-evaluation report outlines the involvement of internal and external stakeholders. Relationships with academic and non-academic stakeholders are presented at both the level of the consortium and the level of the partner institutions. To formally involve these stakeholders the Associated Membership was introduced. From the list in the self-evaluation report, the panel learned that these members include local and international law firms, NGOs, private companies and public bodies. Most of the Associated Members are also member of the EMLE Advisory Committee and some take part in the Mid-Term Meeting in February. During the site visit, the panel asked how involved these stakeholders were in assuring the quality of the programme. From the interviews it was clear that the feedback from these Associated Members varies and most constructive feedback regarding employability comes from those associate members where the main contact is an EMLE graduate.

The self-evaluation report repeatedly includes references to student involvement. For each course, students fill out standardised questionnaires. These cover contents, quality of teaching, aptness of the exam and practical organisation. The panel has been able to examine the overall analyses made of these questionnaires by EMLE’s Quality Assurance Officer and found these to be extremely encompassing and, where necessary, critical. In addition, the programme has an exit survey at the end of the third term which focuses on the thesis and the overall impression of the programme.

The staff involved in the joint programme meets at least twice a year at the occasion of Board Meetings. As mentioned above, the programme organizes a Teachers Summer Meeting, especially for the management and teachers of the 1st and 2nd term partners. The main purpose of this meeting is to coordinate the courses of the first and second term. Here, courses, evaluations and improvements are discussed.

The panel found that students are also directly involved in the programme’s quality assurance. Students elect one or two representative(s) in both the 1st and 2nd term at all

partner universities. These representatives can discuss all relevant issues with the local members of the Quality Assurance Committee. The Quality Assurance Officer also meets with these student representatives during the Mid-Term Meeting in February to discuss issues raised at the Board Meeting. The panel found the programme to be very aware of the difficulties of student representation in such a complicated programme (i.e. short terms with a lot of mobility). As pointed out by the management and the teaching staff, this could on the one hand undermine the continuity of student representation and on the other hand make it difficult for the programme to get feedback. But the panel found that the programme has succeeded in overcoming these potential pitfalls. The students and alumni interviewed were very aware that student feedback can have an impact. The self-evaluation report indicates that the alumni are involved in different ways but also makes plain clear that efforts to involve alumni have not always been successful. The programme has, for example, established an Alumni Association of which the activity largely depends on alumni involvement. This involvement is presented as most often temporary. In addition, alumni are invited to the Mid-Term Meeting in February and some actually attend. The self-evaluation report furthermore details how the EMLE Alumni have been asked about their labour-market position and the importance of the EMLE programme for them. Of all the alumni with valid contact details, 336 filled in the survey in 2011. From the site visit the panel learned that the programme is actively trying to create graduate communities (per graduation year) and an overall alumni community.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that students, staff, employers and alumni are involved in internal quality assurance activities.

Criterion 4c: Continuous improvement

The effectiveness of the system with regard to the continuous improvement of the programme can be demonstrated.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report puts forward specific approaches to how improvements are realised and here refers to those elements of the internal quality assurance system that continuously contribute to improving quality, such as the course evaluations and the resulting discussions and suggestions for improvements. The panel was surprised not to find any actual examples of recent improvements and no reference at all to earlier external quality assurance procedures and resulting recommendations. During the site visit, the panel asked all groups interviewed for examples of improvements. The management of the programme declared they had a permanent and incremental approach to improvement. For the offered curriculum, the intention is to learn from best practices. When courses are identified as such, the management spreads this practice to the other locations. Their example referred to the thesis. The thesis is not something familiar for all incoming students and some students therefore found the thesis difficult to tackle. The programme alleviated this issue by offering dedicated seminars. The management is convinced this indeed improved the produced theses.

Students told the panel they knew from their contacts with graduates that things have changed for the better. They explicitly referred to the microeconomics course as an example of improvement.

The teaching staff demonstrated that they indeed focused on the offered courses. Their example referred to the fact that they found that behavioural law and economics had become part of mainstream literature and thus this topic was moved from the second to the first term. The teachers corroborated the management's best practices approach. Teaching improvements are the result of benchmarking across partners and presenting best practices as exemplary and then introducing these practices elsewhere.

The panel found more examples of improvements both in the self-evaluation report (but not under this criterion 4c) and in the interviews with the different groups during the site visit.

The panel additionally likes to mention the programme's methodical use of second markers when assessing students. In addition to the first marker, each thesis is marked by a second marker from one of the other/partner institutions. These second markers ensure that there is comparability across the marking between the different institutions involved in the programme.

Many joint programmes lack uniformity in the marking between institutions and countries with (traditionally) different student assessment cultures. The panel thinks that EMLE has addressed this and is still addressing this very well. Second marking is also included under [Criterion 6b: Assessment of students](#) but is presented here as an issue since the panel regards it as an example of EMLE's systematic approach to internal quality assurance.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme is self-reflective and can demonstrate the effectiveness of their internal quality assurance system through continuous improvements. The panel would like to recommend the programme to systematically track improvements in order to develop a shared memory of internal quality assurance results.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 4. Internal quality assurance

The panel has found a well-developed internal quality assurance system, which has been developed over quite a long period into what the panel commendably refers to as a "bureaucratic red carpet". The programme's self-critical, self-reflective approach, its careful and increasing involvement of stakeholders, its use of second markers and its permanent and incremental approach to improvement with its focus on benchmarking convinces the panel that these aspects can be regarded as an international example for other joint programme. The panel therefore assesses *Standard 4. Internal quality assurance* as excellent.

Standard 5. Facilities and student support

Criterion 5a: Facilities

The facilities provided are sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report outlines the facilities provided to students. All EMLE students are treated local students and have the same access to facilities. The report explicitly refers to the following: library, electronic databases, study rooms, internet/intranet access, sport facilities, social and cultural events, medical services, and the international office. Visiting scholars furthermore get an office and (normally) a computer.

During the site visit, the students and alumni were asked if there were differences in facilities at the locations and whether these differences mattered for their studies (i.e. to achieve the learning outcomes). The students told the panel that all programme materials are available via GoogleDocs and that access to research journals is the same everywhere. The management was found to be aware of the different systems and access to libraries and research papers. To alleviate this problem, the programme introduced the sharing of essential research papers proactively via GoogleDocs.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme provides more than adequate facilities which enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 5b: Support

Student support provided by the joint programme contributes to the achievement of the learning outcomes and, where applicable, to designing individual study pathways.

Findings:

The self-evaluation report puts forward that they provide support through a streamlined provision of study materials (outlined under 5a) and specialised information on the EMLE website. In addition, students are said to be made aware of interesting conferences and recommended literature.

The panel here additionally took into account the availability of the ombudsman and the welcome meetings. These meetings are organised at the beginning of each term by each of the local coordinators. Here the students are introduced to the practicalities of the programme and the mobility arrangements. Mobility is however restricted since only a limited number of places is available at each location. The panel found that students choice seems to be mainly based on the specialisation offered at locations.

Students told the panel that changing locations three times can undermine learning if you need two weeks each time to accommodate yourself. The programme was said to have taken them out of their comfort zones. They considered it a strength and a weakness and for the students the positive trade-off seems to count. The support to choose their study locations was deemed sufficient by the students, mainly since their choices were based on specialisations offered at each location.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme provides student support which contributes to the achievement of the learning outcomes. Students are sufficiently facilitated in designing individual study pathways.

Criterion 5c: Services

The programme provides adequate student services to facilitate mobility (e.g. housing, guidance for incoming and outgoing students, visa issues, etc.).

Findings:

The self-evaluation report explains that partner institutions take care of visa and residence permit requirements for the EMLE students and the visiting scholars. The partnership claims to make sure that students and scholars are contacted in due time to submit the necessary documents. Furthermore, the self-evaluation report outlines how each partner assists students in finding suitable accommodation during their period of stay. Student should also be supplied with broad information packages on everything concerning their stay, normally in advance and, in case this is not possible, on their arrival. As required by Erasmus Mundus regulations, the EMLE coordinator arranges insurance coverage for all grant-receiving students. This insurance package covers medical expenses, accidents, emergency assistance, legal liability, legal assistance and personal possessions. The programme offers students the possibility to write their master thesis in English or in the language of the European country where the student spends the third term, but only if this language is not the student’s mother tongue. To support this policy, language courses are offered to EMLE students at all European partner universities. The panel found all these services to be well-documented. During the site visit, the students reported problems regularly encountered by students in Erasmus Mundus programmes: (1) visa issues due to Schengen's visa regulations and the short mobility windows and (2) housing issues at some of the partner locations where housing is arranged privately.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme provides more than adequate guidance for incoming and outgoing students, arranges or assists in arranging housing, and facilitates students in their visa and residence permit applications.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 5. Facilities and student support

The panel has found a programme purposefully facilitating their students. The coordinated approach to student support across the locations, from the welcome meetings to the ombudsman (when something goes wrong), the harmonised access to study material and research articles, and the well-documented services convince the panel that these aspects contribute to systematically surpassing the underlying criteria. The panel therefore assesses *Standard 4. Internal quality assurance* as good.

Standard 6. Teaching and learning

Criterion 6a: Staff

The composition of the staff (quantity, qualifications, professional and international experience, etc.) is adequate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes

Findings:

The self-evaluation report puts forward the requirements for staff: a course needs to be taught by an expert in the topic of the course who publishes in that research field. In addition, each of these experts needs to have experience as a teacher as well. EMLE staff consists of both permanent staff of partners and visiting scholars. The self-evaluation report adds that these visiting scholars only teach at some moments and for some courses. In addition, visiting scholars are involved in thesis supervision.

The panel has received the CVs of the staff and found them to be well-known scholars who authoritatively contribute to scientific journals. The amount of staff is more than adequate and from the CVs it is clear they have excellent professional and international experience. To conclude, the panel found the staff to be excellent. For such a complex programme that brings together different attitudes and sensitivities, the panel considers them to be the best and brightest to help students achieve the programme's intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that quantity, qualifications, and professional and international experience of the staff contributes in an excellent way to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Criterion 6b: Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achievements of learning outcomes are applied in a consistent manner among partner institutions and oriented to the intended learning outcomes.

Findings:

The *EMLE Cooperation Agreement* outlines the exam criteria. These include the requirements for obtaining the degree, the full recognition of credits among partners, the use of the European Credit Transfer System, the final ranking of students and the decision-structure. The *Exam and Thesis Regulations* are annexed to the *EMLE Cooperation Agreement*. These regulations cover the term exams and their evaluation, the thesis and the thesis evaluation, grade calculation and graduation requirements, and, finally, articles on missing exams, cheating and plagiarism. In addition, EMLE uses an EMLE ECTS Grading Table based on the results of the previous five years. This table includes the EMLE term exam grades (with an interval of 0.5), the grading percentage and the cumulative percentage. The programme normalises grades across all partner institutions.

The programme has a Deliberation Committee, consisting of the Local Coordinator of each partner and chaired by the Director, which discusses graduation, ranking and academic honours. The programme additionally has a Thesis Committee, which consists of the Director and two representatives from other universities (elected by the board), which discusses the grading of the theses and advises the Deliberation Committee.

During the site visit, the management and the teaching staff explained some of these elements more in-depth. Exam results follow the students to their new location. The programme gives feedback to students about their individual performance mainly through feedback meetings in group. A student can additionally have an individual meeting and review their marked exam. If they are then still not satisfied, the appeal system can be used. The panel found that the thesis was always marked by a second marker and

sometimes a third marker. The teaching staff explained that these markers are from outside the institution of the supervisor but generally from within the partnership, though not necessarily from within the EMLE programme. Second and third markers can however also be specialists on the thesis subject from outside the Consortium. These second and third markers are paid for their job. The panel found that master's thesis feedback is most often just the grade. The teaching staff clarified that there is an internal one-page assessment (narrative report) which is not shared unless students ask for it.

During the site visit, the panel found that students and alumni knew the above outlined assessment system. In addition, they were aware of the appeal system in place in the programme. They also added that students can redo exams, even at the following location. The one complaint from students and alumni was the lack of or late feedback on the grading for written exams and the thesis. The importance of this lies in the reduced opportunity for assessment, particularly of exam papers, to play an integral part in the subsequent learning processes. The panel confronted the teaching staff with this complaint. They agreed they should look into this issue. A solution, according to the teaching staff, would be to bring all the assessments to the midterm meeting, but this would also result in a huge administrative burden.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the examination regulations and the assessment of the achievements of learning outcomes are applied in a consistent manner among partner institutions and oriented to the intended learning outcomes. The panel recommends the programme make greater use of their assessment approaches as part of the students' learning experience. Feedback after assessment can significantly enhance and reinforce learning.

Criterion 6c: Achievement

The programme can demonstrate that the learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings:

In the self-evaluation report the programme presents the thesis as the primary demonstration that its graduates have achieved EMLE's intended learning outcomes. The programme's rationale here is that the research and the writing process turn the learning throughout the taught curriculum into tangible application. Each student is therefore required to formulate a research question and to compose a well-structured scientific piece of work.

The programme additionally presents labour-market positions and further doctorate studies as a secondary demonstration of the achievement of EMLE's intended learning outcomes. For the latter, the programme refers to the European Doctorate Programme in Law and Economics (EDLE) offered by the partners from Bologna, Hamburg and Rotterdam. Since the first EDLE graduations in 2009, 11 EMLE graduates successfully participated in this doctorate programme.

From the list of graduates of 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, the panel has randomly selected 30 students. This list was then reduced to 15 to differentiate by the grades awarded. Each of the panel members was able to read a selection of these theses. The panel found that the thesis was marked by two separate examiners. Where a thesis was marked with a

significantly different grade, a third examiner would give an additional grade. The panel found the grading correct and in line with expectations. The theses can indeed be used as a basis to establish whether the students achieve EMLE's intended learning outcomes. From reading these, the panel concludes that the grading of achievement is in line with the programme details, and with generic international and discipline-specific expectations. Further, the systematic internal quality assurance ensures that critical assessments are agreed between two or more different assessors.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel concludes that the programme can indeed demonstrate that the learning outcomes are achieved.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 6. Teaching and learning

The panel has found a programme with a staff of well-known, excellent scholars, with regulations that ensure the consistent and transparent assessment of students' learning, with second marking and with master's theses through which it can demonstrate the achievement of its intended learning outcomes. The panel therefore assesses *Standard 6. Teaching and learning* as excellent.

Standard 7. National components (per country)

National component Flanders: Achievement of learning outcomes

Procedural component: In order to assess criterion 6c regarding the achievement of learning outcomes, the assessment panel is required to look at students' work which, according to the joint programme (and indicated in the self-evaluation report), demonstrate that their graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. Students' work can here refer to a final thesis but also to other products (work of art, portfolio, etc.). [...]

Findings:

The assessment panel selected (randomly and differentiated by marks achieved) fifteen theses from a list of graduates for the last two completed academic years. For each student selected, the panel has examined the thesis and its assessment.

Conclusion and recommendations:

This procedural component has been implemented. The procedure itself and the findings of the panel have been included under [Criterion 6c. Achievement](#).

National component Germany: Transparency

The study programme, course of study, examination requirements and the prerequisites for admittance including the regulations for compensating disadvantages of handicapped students are documented and published.

Findings:

As outlined under 1b, the *Cooperation Agreement* covers all these aspects explicitly. These elements are also publicly available on the EMLE website. In addition, the *EMLE Student Agreement* states that the programme and its partners provides the students with “*all necessary learning support facilities and any other service associated with the Programme with reasonable care and skill*”.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme meets this criterion.

National component Germany: Equal opportunity

- a. Regulations are provided for compensating disadvantages of handicapped students;*
- b. The interests of handicapped students are taken into consideration throughout the study process;*
- c. Compensating disadvantages of handicapped students with regard to time-related and formal guidelines in the studies as well as in the final performance tests and those during the studies is ensured;*
- d. The concepts of the Higher Education Institution for gender justice and for the promotion of equal opportunities of students in special situations such as students having health impairments, students having children, foreign students, students with migration background and/or from so-called educationally disadvantaged classes are implemented at the level of the programme.*

Findings:

The Cooperation Agreement, as outlined under 1b, and the *EMLE Student Agreement* cover these aspects explicitly or implicitly.

EMLE also considers itself also an equal opportunity programme. Its advertisements include that “*severely disabled persons are given preference over candidates not subject to preferential treatment in accordance with the law, where they are equally suitable, able and qualified for the position*”. Example:

[http://www.emle.org/ data/job_advertisement.pdf](http://www.emle.org/data/job_advertisement.pdf). In addition, regulations for equal opportunity are also in place at all participating universities.

Regarding economically disadvantaged students, EMLE charges differentiated tuition fees according to the per-capita GNP (based on World Bank statistics). The programme also provides partial tuition fee waivers to the 15 highest ranking non-European students who do not receive an Erasmus Mundus scholarship.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme meets this criterion.

National component Germany: Formal requirements length and content

- a. The standard period of study for full-time study amounts to four, three or two semesters for Master’s programmes;*
- b. A Master’s qualification requires 300 ECTS credits including the preceding programmes for the first qualification for entry into a profession. This requirement may be waived in special cases where students can demonstrate that they are suitably qualified;*

- c. Master's programmes require a dissertation, the purpose of which is to demonstrate the ability to deal independently with a problem in the relevant subject area on the basis of academic methods within a set period of time.*
- d. The Master's dissertation should range from 15 to 30 ECTS credits.*
- e. A module (which may comprise content taught within one semester or academic year, or extend over several semesters) is generally concluded with one examination and should account for at least five ECTS credits.*

Findings:

In Germany, EMLE has been categorised as a one-year, 60 ECTS, LL.M., master's programme.

The programme has three semesters and requires 300 ECTS credits when including the preceding programmes for the first qualification for entry into a profession. EMLE only waives this requirement when students can demonstrate that they are suitably qualified. The EMLE programme includes a master's thesis of 15 ECTS which, according to the panel, demonstrates the ability to deal independently with problems in the field of law and economics. All modules account for exactly 5 ECTS and end with an examination.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme meets this criterion.

National component Germany: Consecutive or further education

- a. Master's programmes should be assigned to one of the categories "consecutive study courses" or "study courses providing further education".*
- b. Consecutive master's programmes are to be structured as study courses which consolidate or extend knowledge, are multi-disciplinary or cover a different subject.*
- c. Further education programmes require qualified practical professional experience of, as a rule, no less than one year.*
- d. The content of the Master's programmes providing further education should take professional experience into account and build on it.*

Findings:

The EMLE programme extends knowledge and is multi-disciplinary.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme meets this criterion.

National component Israel: Joint degree

The degree awarded to the graduates of the joint programme must be joint academic degrees. The degree must list the institutions on the degree certificate.

Findings:

The EMLE programme does not award a joint degree yet.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme does not meet this criterion.

National component The Netherlands: Achievement of learning outcomes

Procedural component: In order to assess criterion 6c regarding the achievement of learning outcomes, the assessment panel is required to look at students' work which, according to the joint programme (and indicated in the self-evaluation report), demonstrate that their graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. Students' work can here refer to a final thesis but also to other products (work of art, portfolio, etc.). [...]

Findings:

The assessment panel selected (randomly and differentiated by marks achieved) fifteen theses from a list of graduates for the last two completed academic years. For each student selected, the panel has examined the thesis and its assessment.

Conclusion and recommendations:

This procedural component has been implemented. The procedure itself and the findings of the panel have been included under [Criterion 6c. Achievement](#).

National component The Netherlands: General conclusion

The assessment panel needs to come to a general conclusion regarding the joint programme. This general conclusion is either unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent and needs to be weighted and substantiated. [...]

Findings:

The assessment panel has found that the programme remarkably exceeds generic quality. It does this systematically and across its entire spectrum and can be regarded as an example for other joint programmes.

The panel's conclusion is in line with the operationalization of excellent in this national component and agrees that:

- The intended learning outcomes correspond with master's level in the relevant qualification frameworks and meet the relevant subject-specific requirements. These learning outcomes have been made concrete as a result of the programme's explicit and unique perspective. The programme serves as an example both nationally and internationally.
- The combination of curriculum, staff and services constitutes an innovative and original learning environment.
- The achieved learning outcomes are of outstanding quality and translate into awards and publications.
- Quality assurance in the programme is pursued methodically, leading to a coherent improvement policy and a strong ability for self-reflection, demonstrated by a robust quality culture.

Conclusion and recommendations:

The panel assess the joint programme as excellent.

National component Poland: The length of studies

a. First cycle studies take at least 180 ECTS;

- b. Second cycle studies take at least 90 ECTS;*
- c. Five-year long cycle studies take at least 300 ECTS;*
- d. Six-year long cycle studies take at least 360 ECTS;*

Findings:

The self-evaluation report states that the Warsaw School of Economics has been granted an official permission by the Ministry of Higher Education which allows it to take from the EMLE programme either 4-year bachelor or master's degree holders. Credits obtained when receiving those degrees are corresponded to equivalent credits in Warsaw. Only then, and after successfully completing the EMLE programme, the Polish partner is able to award a degree in accordance with the Polish national rules. This approach ensures that the programme requires 300 ECTS credits in total.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme meets this criterion.

National component Poland: Staff requirements

- a. The minimum core staff consists of at least six teachers which hold the academic title of professor or doktor habilitowany and six teachers which hold the academic degree of Ph.D;*
- b. The members of the minimum core staff have to be full-time employees of the higher education institution that offers the joint programme, and at least since the beginning of the semester. This institution has to be their primary employment;*
- c. Each member of the minimum core staff has to teach at least 30 (for a professor or doktor habilitowany) or 60 hours of class during the academic year and within the programme;*

Findings:

The self-evaluation report outlines how the Warsaw School of Economics fulfils the national staff requirements. The institution has informed the Ministry of Higher Education that they have enough professors, doctors habilitowany and doctors.

From the self-evaluation report, it is clear that EMLE's core staff group consists of more than six teachers which hold the academic title of professor or doctor habilitowany and of more than six teachers which hold the academic degree of Ph.D. These are full-time employees of the partner institutions. They have been employed for more than a year and the partner institution is here their primary employment.

The core staff teaches one course a year. The number of class hours per course is at least 22 hours (11 lectures with 2 hours each). In addition, these teachers are responsible for the supervision of at least one thesis. Supervision includes the thesis seminar and acting as first and second marker. This adds on average 15 hours to the core staff workload.

Conclusion:

The panel concludes that the programme meets this criterion.

4. Executive summary

The European Master of Law and Economics (EMLE) was assessed by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) and this assessment procedure took place within the framework of the JOQAR project. NVAO convened an assessment panel which studied the programme's self-evaluation report and undertook a site visit at Hamburg University.

The panel considers EMLE a well-established programme which has well-documented its cooperation. This is exemplified by the comprehensiveness of their cooperation agreement. The programme has a cautious approach to the legal frameworks in which it operates and this is appreciated by the panel. The panel also highly values the self-reflective attitude of the consortium towards the added value of the joint programme.

The programme's intended learning outcomes correspond with the overarching qualification frameworks and thus enable graduates to perform the Economic Analysis of Law. They also accommodate the fact that most of the students come in with either a legal or an economic background. EMLE clearly has a tradition of developing and evaluating learning outcomes. The panel lauds the programme's approach to include all stakeholders, not only in continuing its development but also in evaluating its learning outcomes. and to involve the professional field in a structural and coherent manner.

The programme has well-documented its admission and selection procedure, including criteria in which different disciplinary and national backgrounds are accommodated. The curriculum more than appropriately incorporates many different perspectives and clashing disciplinary opinions. The panel appreciates how the programme has matched its credit distribution with an appropriate grading table.

The internal quality assurance system has been found to be well-developed. The panel commendably refers to this system as a “bureaucratic red carpet”. The programme is self-critical and self-reflective. It has carefully and increasingly involved its stakeholders in its quality assurance system and uses second markers when assessing students. The programme has a permanent and incremental approach to improvement including a focus on benchmarking.

The joint programme provides facilities and services that purposefully facilitate its students. The programme has a shared approach to provide student support across the locations, from a welcome week to an ombudsman. Access to study material and research articles is harmonised and all provided services are well-documented.

The staff of the EMLE programme are well-known, excellent scholars. They use regulations that ensure the consistent and transparent assessment of students’ learning. Since many joint programmes still lack uniformity in their marking, the panel lauds EMLE’s use of second, and sometimes even third, marking in addition to the EMLE ECTS Grading Table. The panel read a random, differentiated selection of the master’s theses of the last two years. These indeed demonstrate that graduates achieve EMLE’s intended learning outcomes.

To conclude, students in this joint programme study a coherent curriculum taught by excellent staff and supported by beneficial services and facilities. These elements enable students to achieve EMLE’s intended learning outcomes, which the panel considers to be at master’s level and enable performing Economic Analysis of Law. A systematic approach to internal quality assurance contributes demonstrably to a consistent improvement perspective within the consortium. The programme has a transparent and coherent student assessment system, which clearly demonstrates that EMLE students achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Standard	Criterion	Level of fulfilment
1. General conditions	1a. Recognition	Excellent
	1b. Cooperation agreement	
	1c. Added value	
2. Intended learning outcomes	2a. Shared	Excellent
	2b. Level	
	2c. Subject/discipline	
3. Programme	3a. Admission	Excellent
	3b. Structure	
	3c. Credits	
4. Internal quality assurance system	4a. Common understanding	Excellent
	4b. Stakeholder involvement	
	4c. Continuous improvement	
5. Facilities and student support	5a. Facilities	Good
	5b. Support	
	5c. Services	
6. Teaching and learning	6a. Staff	Excellent
	6b. Assessment of students	
	6c. Achievement	
7. National components	Flanders	Fulfilled
	Germany	Fulfilled
	Israel	Not fulfilled
	The Netherlands	Excellent
	Poland	Fulfilled

Annex 1: Composition of the assessment panel

Dr. Nick Harris, former Director Development and Enhancement Group, QAA (UK)

At the QAA, Dr. Nick Harris developed the components of what was then called the Academic Infrastructure and is now referred to as UK the Quality Code for Higher Education. As director, he was responsible for the maintenance and further development and promotion of this Quality Code.

Dr. Harris has been involved in both the detail and increasingly in the strategic development of the Bologna process. He was a founder member of Joint Quality Initiative (which developed the Dublin Descriptors), took part in several European quality assurance projects, was the co-author of the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area, has been co-opted as an expert to the European Consortium for Accreditation, and has been invited to join various European Commission working groups.

Prof. Dr. Prof. Roberto Pardolesi, Director Law & Economics LAB, LUISS Guido Carli

Prof. Roberto Pardolesi is a Full Professor of Comparative Law and Professor of Private Law at the Faculty of Economics of LUISS “Guido Carli” University of Rome.

Prof. Pardolesi is widely acknowledged as an authoritative academic and practitioner in the fields of antitrust, comparative law and economic analysis of law. He was a pioneer in the introduction of interdisciplinary law and economics approaches. He is author and editor of several books and hundreds of articles and essays. He is a member of the International Academy of Comparative Law, Italian Association of Comparative Law, Steering Committee of the European Association of Law and Economics, European Mergers Task Force, Scientific Committee of the National Antitrust Authority.

Prof. Jean-Yves Art, Associate General Counsel at Microsoft

Prof Jean-Yves Art is Associate General Counsel at Microsoft, based in Brussels. He leads a team of lawyers who counsel on all antitrust and regulatory aspects of Microsoft's

activities in the EMEA region. In close coordination with the company's headquarters in Redmond, he also manages regulatory proceedings, including antitrust proceeding involving Microsoft in the region.

Before joining Microsoft in 2002, Prof. Art practiced competition law with law firms in Paris and Brussels and before that he worked for three years as a law clerk at the European Court of Justice.

Prof. Art is an invited professor at the College of Europe, SciencesPo and the University of Liège. He teaches on law and economics topics such as EU merger control and advanced topics in EU competition law.

Ieva Baltiņa, student European Studies, University of Latvia

Ieva Baltiņa is a graduate of Business Logistics and former international affairs officer at the Student Union of Latvia. She participated as a student expert and methodologist in a clustered study field evaluation organised by the Council of Higher Education in Latvia and took part as a student expert in programme assessments.

Ieva Baltiņa has been trained as a student QA expert by the Student Union of Latvia, by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and by the European Students Union (ESU). In addition, she is a member of the QA pool of the Institutional Evaluation Programme of the European Association of Universities (EUA).

Overview of the expertise/experience of the panel:

	S	I	P	E	Q	S
Dr. Nick Harris		X		X	X	
Prof. Dr. Prof. Roberto Pardolesi	X	X		X		
Prof. Jean-Yves Art	X	X	X			
Ieva Baltiņa		X			X	X

- S: subject-/discipline-specific expertise;
- I: International expertise & experience;
- P: professional field expertise & experience;
- E: educational experience;
- Q: quality assurance and/or audit experience
- S: student expert.

Annex 2: Statements of Independence

Here I will include the scans of the signed versions of the statements.

Annex 3: Documents reviewed

- Self-evaluation report
- EMLE Consortium Agreement (at the start of EM II, 2009)
- Consortium Agreement Annex I – EMLE Learning Outcomes
- Consortium Agreement Annex II – EMLE Structure 2010-2015
- Consortium Agreement Annex III – EMLE Courses 2010-2015
- Consortium Agreement Annex IV – EMLE Student Agreement
- Consortium Agreement Annex V – EMLE Exam & Thesis Regulations
- Consortium Agreement Annex VI – Scholarship Agreement Cat A and B
- 19 CVs of the most relevant staff:
 - Aix/Marseille: Garelo, Krecké
 - Bologna: Denicolo, Franzoni, Parisi
 - Ghent: Albrecht, Depoorter, Van der Elst
 - Haifa: Gazal
 - Hamburg: Eger, Leyens, Voigt
 - Mumbai: Babu
 - Rotterdam: Paccès, Van den Bergh, Visscher
 - Vienna: Weigel
 - Warsaw: Balcerowicz, Beldowski
- Evaluation Form (per course)
- Rotterdam course Competition 2012/13
- Evaluation Report 2010-2011 - 1st term
- Evaluation Report 2010-2011 - 2nd term
- Evaluation Form 2011-2012 - 3rd term and general
- Evaluation Summary 2011-2012 - 3rd term and general
- Diploma Supplement Rotterdam 2011-2012 Example
- Diploma Rotterdam 2011-2012 Example

Annex 4: Site visit programme

Overview

Date:	15 March 2013
Coordinator:	Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam
Partners:	University of Hamburg, University of Bologna, University of Gent, University of Aix-Marseille, University of Vienna, Warsaw School of Economics, University of Haifa and Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research
Programme:	European Master of Law and Economics
Location:	Head Building, room 308 Edmund-Siemers-Allee 1 Hamburg

Programme

Thursday 14 March 2013

- 16.00 - 19.00: Preparatory meeting of the panel
19.00 Dinner

Friday 15 March 2013

Due to a strike at Hamburg Airport, the schedule of the site visit was rearranged to ensure the panels departure from the airport.

09.00 - 09.30: Review of the documentation and theses, distribution of student work.

09.30 - 10.30: Meeting with management of the joint programme

<i>Full name</i>	<i>Position</i>
• Alessio Paccess	Erasmus Mundus Coordinator
• Roger Van den Bergh	Former Erasmus Mundus Coordinator
• Wicher Schreuders	Erasmus Mundus Assistant Coordinator
• Thomas Eger	Programme Director

10.30 - 11.30: Meeting with students

<i>Full name</i>	<i>Previous background subject / discipline</i>
• Cintia Nunes	Law
• Carlos Monteza Palacios	Law
• Mate Kakas	Law
• Allen Ralph	Business and Law
• Ines Reith	Health
• Puja Doshi	Anthropology

11.30 - 12.30: Meeting with teaching staff

<i>Full name</i>	<i>Location</i>
• Pierre Garello	Aix
• Luigi Franzoni	Bologna
• Oren Gazal	Haifa
• Louis Visscher	Rotterdam
• Patrick Leyens	Hamburg
• Ben Depoorter	Ghent

12.30 – 13.00: Lunch

13.00 - 13.45: Meeting with alumni

<i>Full name</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Current position</i>
• Teja Barkmann	2009	Financial Service
• Johanna Gaviria Rodriguez	2011	Legal firm
• Henri Songeur	2011	Venture Capital Firm
• Hila Nevo	2001	Professor Anti-competition
• Elena Reznichenko	2010	Doctoral student
• Philippe Hanke	2009	Doctoral student

14.30 - 15.00: Meeting with management

tion

www.eacaconsortium.net

www.grossroads.eu