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✓ Task Force and its members

✓ Aim

✓ Activities
Development and administration of Joint Programmes at Doctoral Level (workpackage 4)

- **TF Leader**: University of Graz
- **Task Force members**: University of Bergen, University of Bochum, University of Bordeaux 1, University of Deusto, University of Lille 1, University of Padova, University of Vilnius
- **Aim**: to develop a good practice schemes and guidelines for the development and management of JDP
Call for papers

Self evaluation exercise

Study visits

Final Report
Call for Papers

- **Target group:** scientific staff, and young researchers, administrators form HEI

- **Aim:** gain an insight into key issues on **policy** as well as **management** level

- **5 Papers:** University of Iasi, University of Rome Sapienza, University of Edinburgh, Mykolas Romeris University, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona
Target group: joint doctoral programmes with involvement of JOIMAN partners, EMJD and others (32 joint doctoral programmes invited to take part)

Issues covered: partnership, research or educational cooperation, organisational structure, recruiting/admission, supervision, research/formal training/courses/thesis/defence, monitoring/reporting, legal framework, entering workforce, funding

AIM: identify challenges and good practices
Study visits / Interviews

- 11 study visits undertaken
- Collecting more details on various research-related issues
- Focus on challenges and possible solutions/good practices
- Detecting trends and patterns
Aim: provide guidance for development and running

Focus: research opportunities and research cooperation

Limitations: self-report method, view and opinions of coordinators only, short reference time, low response rate for self-evaluation
**Added value**

**bottom-up approach** – from research group/network to joint doctoral programme

**top-down approach** – part of the institutional strategy

- **Added value for the institution, research group or field**
  - Societal needs,
  - Strengthening/structuring collaborations,
  - Quality, Diversity,
  - Attractiveness / Brain drain prevention
Added value for the doctorate candidates

- Diversity - teaching methods/cultures and of candidates’
- Mobility -
- Job market – access in different countries
- Excellence - group the best researchers in a given discipline
Types – degree of jointness 1

- **International Collaboration**: less or no structure including research cooperation and/or student exchange

- **Individual doctoral Programmes**: e.g. Cotutelle, including formalization of cooperation around one or several candidates
  - In use also with consortium agreements where joint or double degree is possible
- **Joint Doctoral Programme**: A doctoral Programme developed and/or provided by two or more higher education institutions, leading to the award of a double, multiple or joint degree

- **Joint Doctoral degree**: A Programme developed and/or provided by two or more higher education institutions → joint degree issued jointly by two or more HEI
Different types – different type or “upscale” of jointness

BUT NOT “upscale” of quality!

Quality depends on different factors
  - Research quality
  - Partners
  - Legal constrains
  - Etc.

Critical mass influences the types of jointness

more candidates → more admin. structure
more funding
Partnerships

Reasons for selecting partners:
- Long-lasting scientific cooperation
- Excellence/reputation (publication record, supervision)
- Common research interest
- Compatible national systems

Agreement types:
- Bilateral
- Consortium
- mixture
Partnerships

To be considered:

- Compatible (or complementary) scientific interest (added value!)
- Committed staff (administrative and academic)
- Financial aspects/situation
- Clear roles, responsibilities – future organisational structure
- Continuous communication, frequent meetings
- Inclusion associated partners (industry, business – where appropriate)
Some characteristics:

- partial autonomy or more joint
- joint activities -> around research only or + training

Depending on the scientific field, national legal issues, different traditions and funding

Research projects: predefined or individual
Research/formal training

- **Training/lectures** (and/or summer schools, conferences etc.)
  - additional benefits in terms of better employability
  - bringing the candidates together
  - define early to include or not, if obligatory, which partners will offer them
  - credits or not?

- **Communication**: important factor
Joint thesis committees

Defence Committee comprises members from at least two partners – sometimes external experts

Thesis written in English or language of the home institution - at the home university according to the national/local regulations

Defences takes place in public in front of defence committee
Joint degree: not possible in all countries due to national legislations

Therefore – **various solutions:**

- One single certificate issued with legal value in all participating countries.
- Jointly diploma plus an additional certificate.
- Double diploma depending on the doctoral candidate’s mobility.
Supervision/monitoring/reporting

- Mostly joint supervision
  *Often the basis for developing the programme*

- Candidates sign training and supervision plan/a career development plan and detailed work plan

- Regular monitoring and reporting (different intervals)

- Evaluation Committee/panel/board
Organisational Structure

EMJD vs. other joint doctoral programmes?

- EMJDs – similar structure
- Other joint doctoral programmes – variety of models
  - strong coordinating instituton
  - Steering Body/joint body only overall management
- Structure related to SIZE OF THE NETWORK
- Higher integration on. organisational tasks
  - more administrative support needed
  - High degree of jointness – administrative tasks managed at at institutional level (scientific task at consortium level)
Recruiting/selection/admission

- Recruiting through internet/website + emails
- Application – on-line (transparency) vs. paper
- Centralised administrative procedures as good practice
- Joint selection by „selection committee“ – Few programmes applying internal regulations/procedures
- Interviewing candidates
Still a challenge and hindrance

Main legal obstacles:
- different national laws,
- Certificates,
- funding,
- employment of doctoral candidates, visa requirements etc.

✓ Cotutelle Agreement crucial
✓ Better integration of JDPs into institutional network (involvement of more administrative staff)
Entering workforce

- Good employment chances anticipated
  - Due to small number of JDPs with graduates

- 60 to 90% graduates continue at the university

- Important issues identified:
  - Evaluation of potential employers/sectors
  - Monitoring employability through alumni statistics
  - Different cooperation types and modes with potential employers (placements – future employment)
Different sources of funding:

- University funding (scholarships or travel costs)
- Ministries/national governments
- EU funding / EM
- Banks (Italy)
Challenges and opportunities

IMPORTANT!

Quality of the research cooperation and the common research
grounds are essential

- Need for strong policy on internationalisation and joint doctoral
  programmes in order to succeed with the development of a joint
doctoral Programme
- Need for more flexibility and variety conc. funding
- Need for full recognition of mobility periods
- More flexible solutions with regard to third-country nationals in
  Europe (residence, work permits, etc.) necessary
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