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1. Background
1. This pilot project consisted on the single accreditation of NOHA.

**Single accreditation** = evaluation for the accreditation of the degree programme in just one of the countries in which a joint programme is given, but taking into account the entire programme.

2. The whole procedure shall follow the principles of the ECA document:

**ECA Principles for accreditation procedures regarding joint programmes**

3. Pilot nature of the accreditation
In which countries was Accreditation needed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>Quality Assurance Organization</th>
<th>Compulsory external accreditation process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deusto University, Spain</td>
<td>ANECA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium</td>
<td>AEQES</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RUB University of Bochum, Germany</td>
<td>AQAS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of Aix-Marseille III Paul Cezanne, France</td>
<td>AERES</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University College Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>IUQB</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Groningen, Netherlands</td>
<td>NVAO</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Uppsala, Sweden</td>
<td>HsV</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road map to the pilot accreditation of NOHA
Road map to the pilot accreditation of NOHA

### Analysis and conclusions

#### Activities/Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference of pilot project</td>
<td>April 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANECA’s Procedure for the pilot project on the accreditation of joint programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with NOHA HEIs</td>
<td>Sept 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with NOHA QAAs</td>
<td>Sept 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint selection by NOHA QAAs</td>
<td>Oct 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide for the expert panel</td>
<td>Nov 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to drawing up the self-evaluation report</td>
<td>Oct 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation Report of NOHA programme</td>
<td>Nov 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st site visit Deusto University</td>
<td>Dec 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd site visit Lovain la Neuve University</td>
<td>Feb 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Report on NOHA programme</td>
<td>Mar 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with NOHA QAAs</td>
<td>Mar 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with NOHA HEIs</td>
<td>Sep 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stages of the process:

1. **Self-evaluation**
2. **External review**
3. **Report**

(0) Analysis of the **procedure** by all QA organizations

(4) Analysis of the **report** by all QA organizations
4. Criteria
Which are the standards of the pilot project

1. **ADDED VALUE** that is internationally proven.
2. Guaranteed **ACADEMIC RECOGNITION**.
3. Guaranteed **SERVICES** to the student.
4. Efficient management of **RESOURCES**.
5. Learning activities that are coordinated in an integrated and **JOINTLY DESIGNED STUDY PLAN**.
6. Common and equivalent **LEARNING OUTCOMES**.
7. Demonstrated continuous **REVIEW**.
8. Key **INFORMATION** on the programme that is easily accessible.
5. Experts
The panel

Chairperson

1 Secretary

4 Experts

1 Observer

opinion  Submits report

1. International expert from Sweden (HSV)
2. International expert from the UK (ANECA)
3. Academic expert from the Netherlands (NVAO)
4. Academic expert from Spain (ANECA)
5. Student of a JP from Brasil (ANECA)
6. ANECA staff from Spain (ANECA)
7. AQAS staff from Germany (AQAS)
6. Site visit
1st: Deusto University, Spain
   Complete panel

2nd: Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium
   Half of the panel
7. Report
External Report on the European Master in International Humanitarian Action (NOHA)

Against the Standards of the Pilot project on the accreditation of joint programmes

March 2010
Analysis of the report by the QA Organizations

Reflection

“Would serve this report as the basis for the decision regarding the accreditation of the Master’s degree in all the countries where NOHA is being implemented? What else would be needed?”
8. Decision
Conclusion

NOHA is a programme with considerable strengths. Among these are links with the labour market, diversity and internationalisation, integration and coordination, sustainability and commitment.

The panel finds that NOHA is in substantial compliance with the Standards of the Pilot Project and **recommends that the NOHA programme should be (pilot) accredited** if the following conditions are met:

a) Development of a plan for establishing a formal documented internal quality assurance system for the joint programme.

b) Improvement of consistent information provided in respect of fee polices and students’ academic progress.
Conclusions:

1. QAAs and HEI have found the participation in the pilot accreditation of the JP a very fruitful experience.

2. In general terms, QAAs involved use similar criteria and procedures in their accreditation processes.

3. Representatives from all HEIs of the JP should be able to be interviewed during the accreditation process (physically or virtually).

4. QAAs should agree, before an accreditation process of a JP starts, on the generic aspects to be covered as well as the specific national ones.
OBSTACLES OF QA IN J-P:

- Need to **balance** the different national legal requirements related to the accreditation/QA evaluation frameworks.
- **Well-defined criteria/standards** to allow the experts to make a decision.
- To assure the *jointness* of the programme: to show the advantages against the traditional provision.
- **Coherence of the programme**: Need to identify the role played by each partner within the JP.
- **Self-evaluation report**: need to establish the core elements to be included, avoiding to set up a template.
• Balance in the selection and profile of experts among the different agencies involved.

• Balance between academic and QA experts.

• Site-visit(s): representatives of all institutions involved to be interviewed.

• Site-visit(s): students of the different paths

The interviews can be made by Skype, telephone or online mechanisms.
THE WAY FORWARD

4 possible trends: (after Nick Harris)

1. To define a procedure aimed at the fulfilment of all the requirements of the various QA agencies.

2. To develop a framework/guidelines for the evaluation/accreditation of transnational JPs.

3. “Back to the basics”: rethink what is really necessary and sufficient of QA/accreditation in the EHEA and applied them.

4. To develop a modular approach defining a number of essential “core” criteria for all the countries/agencies, adding “modules” to fulfil the specific needs of certain legal frameworks/countries/agencies.
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