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Aim

- Investigate the obstacles and challenges in the development and management of joint programmes with non-European universities
- In particular with countries outside EHEA
Activities

- ‘Call for paper’ on joint master programmes with non-European partners
- Survey on existing experiences focusing on the main difficulties encountered
- Production of report (www.joiman.eu)
Methodology

- Call for papers
- Study visits
  - Collection JPs with non-European partners
  - Definition of sample
  - Development of questionnaire
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Accepted papers: available at www.joiman.eu

• Challenges on Collaborative provisions (S.Tomassi)
• Benefits and Challenges of Dual Degree Programs: Case of EU and the United States (N.Asgary & P.Foster)
• Joint Programme with non-European partners (A.Verspeeten)
Survey of 17 joint programmes

Funding: EU funded/non-EU funded

- 5 Erasmus Mundus Master courses
- 3 EU/US Atlantis programmes
- 1 Tempus project (Curriculum development)
- 9 JP’s not funded under any EU programme
Geographical distribution:
Countries represented in sample
- Latin American countries (6) : 9 JP’s
- North America (2) : 8 JP’s
- Africa (2) : 6 JP’s
- Russia: 3 JP’s
- Western Balkans (5): 1 JP leading to 4 different Master courses
- Asia (4): 11 JP’s
- Middle East (1): 1 JP
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Study visits focussed on:

1. Strategy

2. Development: design, educational aspects, legal framework, quality assurance

3. Management: communication, administration, organisation of mobility, financial aspects, sustainability
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WHAT DID WE LEARN ?
Motives for establishing JP’s with non-European partner(s)

- Topic-related cooperation: need for content & learning environment, global vision
- Reinforcing existing cooperation: long-standing relationships through research collaboration or mobility programmes
- Geographical cooperation:
  - Cross-border - strategic political reasons: part of bilateral/multilateral agreements to strengthen cooperation between countries or geographical areas
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- **Geographical cooperation:**
  - Country-based approach: institutional policy to strengthen cooperation with certain country or geographical area
- Recruitment of international students
- Capacity building: with developing or emerging countries
- Funding-related cooperation: to ensure extra costs are covered and to provide students and staff with mobility grants
Partnerships

Quality criteria for selection of partnership

- Academic excellence
- Reliability
- Institutional commitment
- Communication channels
- Language proficiency
- Academic compatibility
- Geographical area
Target group: students

Recruitment situation

1. Students from partner universities: bilateral joint programmes and funded under EU/US programme

2. International students

Type of students: search of ‘best’ students connected to:

• availability of scholarships
• Cost of promotional activities
Structure of study programme

Decisive patterns

Joint programme offered/developed:
- in a consortium or in bilateral organisational structure
- requirements set by EU funding
EMMC

- Often existed before as a single programme or loosely offered course modules in one or more universities
- Integrated into one joint programme
- With defined learning outcomes on programme level
- According to EMMC rules
- BUT: as a European consortium
- Inclusion of non-European partner: no change, no adaptation
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Atlantis
- Existed before as a single programme or loosely offered course modules in one or more universities
- Partly integrated into a joint programme
- With defined learning outcomes on programme level (but not in USA)
- According to rules of Atlantis programme
- Non-European partner: impact on joint programme design
Joint programme without EU funding organised in the frame work of a consortium (including a US partner)

- Existed before as a single programme or loosely offered course modules in one or more universities
- Integrated into one joint programme
- With defined learning outcomes for the programme
- Non-European partner: impact on joint programme design
Bilateral joint programme without EU funding

- Existed before as a single programme or loosely offered course modules in one or more universities
- No integration into one joint programme
- Not always learning outcomes at programme level
- Non-European partner: impact on joint programme design
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Mobility:

• Mandatory - physical
  but not always towards non-European partner(s), depending on type of joint programme

• Duration varies: 10 – 120 ECTS credits, but mainly 30 or 60 credits

• Educational activity: course work, summer school, internships, research for MA thesis

• Funding: lot of concerns for non-European AND European students
Role of non-European partners in mobility
Depending on their involvement: high and low integration in partnership

- Erasmus Mundus Master courses (EMMC)
  -> non-mandatory mobility partner, with limited role

- Bilateral cooperation and other joint programmes
  -> significant part of study is done at non-European partner, mostly same learning outcomes
Preparatory courses
To level out academic differences as pre-term module or distance-learning course
Compulsory or non-compulsory

Distance learning
Use is limited at present
For occasional lectures or for tutoring
For language acquisition and cultural initiation
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Educational structures
Legal framework
  ✓ Admission procedures
  ✓ Qualification-awarding
ECTS vs other credit systems
Duration of study cycles
Academic calendar
Admission procedures

Consortium is not a legal body

Chosen procedures depend on level of cooperation

- High level: joint selection, admission at coordinating institution, automatically admitted at partner institutions
- Intermediate: joint selection, admission requirements of ‘entrance’ university -> different rules & documents
- Low level: separate selection (eventually joint screening), admission at ‘entrance’ university
Role of non-European partners

Depending full-fledged partner or not

- Erasmus Mundus Master courses
  -> not involved in selection nor admission (except 1)

- Bilateral cooperation and other joint programmes
  -> ‘equal’ partnership
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Qualification

Decisive elements:
- Consortium vs bilateral organisational structure
- Requirements set by EU funding

Joint degrees are not so common: delivered in some EMMC’s and 1 consortium running without EU funding
Joint and double degrees within one consortium possible
Most JP’s deliver **double degrees**
-> to avoid national legal obstacles

**Involvement of non-European partners**

EMMC: not involved in qualification-awarding (role is very limited!)

EU/US Atlantis: ‘dual’ degrees

Consortium with one US partner: joint degree – **exceptional**!

All other programmes: double degree (European and non-European)
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- Not easy to overcome legal obstacles
  -> pragmatic approach: adapt to the local situation
  BUT: problematic in larger consortia
- No proper legal framework -> no guarantee for quality
- Important! To detect legal differences from the onset
  -> by providing partners translation of important parts of national law, e.g. at kick-off meeting
  -> by consulting each partner’s legal experts on educational matters
- Institutional rules are different -> can often be negotiated for sake of international cooperation or joint programme design
ECTS vs other credits systems

- Within EHEA some HEI have adopted ECTS
- Other use their own or no credit system
  -> different models
    - conversion into ECTS credits by dividing the workload in the foreign country into ECTS
    - find a way of compatibility (1 US = 2 ECTS)

**Important:** to discuss the credit transfer from the onset, find a ‘key’, and establish an agreement in advance!
**Duration of study cycles**

**Obstacle:** harmonization of 3+2 yrs with 4+1 yrs system
- European Master programmes: less attractive
- European students: allowed after 3 years’ BA?

On ‘flexibility’-based solutions:
- US BA4 students are allowed in European MA1
- European 3-year BA equivalent to US 4-year BA
Academic calendar
No typical issue for cooperation with non-European countries

On flexibility-based solutions: among others
shorten or extend duration of semester, introduction of summer term
Asymmetric programme with countries in southern hemisphere (extra advantage that student groups of both partners meet each other)
Accreditation

- complex due to multiple national procedures
- European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA) developed a proposal for European methodology for single JP accreditation procedures - pilot project TEAM II – will include non-European partners (www.ecaconsortium.net)
- EMMC: non-European partners not involved in accreditation procedures
- All other non-European partners are involved, related to the ‘home’ qualification as part of the double degree.
Quality Assurance

- Most JP’s apply quality assurance policy
- EMMC’s have minimum criteria for a joint QAP
- Bilateral cooperation: often maintains own QA standards
- methods: internal & external approach
- Dissimilarities with non-European countries due to cultural differences
JP Management
All programmes inbedded in faculty
Communication sometimes asymmetric: dep-IRO
Different competentities – different autonomy

Obstacles:
- Language competentities
- Lack of experience with JP’s, and adequate solutions
- Cultural differences, e.g. in management ‘style’
- Imbalances in students flows (incoming/outgoing or within consortium)
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Important

- Role for coordinating university in larger consortia to keep communication going on
- Good working IRO’s necessary to run large-scale mobility
- Role of international (academic) co-ordinator to define for each student study path, workload & recognition in case of bilateral joint programme (no integration !)
- Cultural proximity helps !
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Good practices

- Appointment of JP ‘facilitator’ in each partner university for development and implementation of the JP
- Organisation of training programme for administrators in partner universities
- Support of JP unit at central unit
- Producing guidelines at university or national level
Mobility-related issues

Good practices:

• Visa problems remediated by frequent communication with consulates abroad
• Language check in agencies abroad before departure
• Language training at guest universities
• Prepare for cultural differences in other ‘learning environment’ but also as other ‘working conditions’
• Immersion activities
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Good practices:

• Integration activities: assistance by local Ph.d students and tutors

• Accommodation of non-European students with European families on voluntary basis to ensure a better cultural and linguistical immersion and integration

• Creation of ‘family feeling’ in the group
Financial matters

- No ‘full’ costs are calculated
- JP’s mostly run as any other study programme
  • Staff and structural costs paid by universities
  • Travel: university provide budget to pay for visits
    • EMMC & Atlantis provide fee for administration
  • Mobility: sponsored by Ministeries, regions, cities, professional organisations, universities, EU programmes, tuition fees from students.. -> need for scholarships: constant relationship with external sponsors
Sustainability

- Some JP’s depend on scholarships to attract non-European students (EMMC and some bilateral JP’s)
- Some only organised every other year
- Some have large number of tuition fee paying students
- Topic with high strategic value, high employment rate
- Bilateral JP’s tend to look into future more safely
- EMMC no sustainability plan developed, were used to have secured income
Conclusions

- Challenges not proportionally increased with geographical distances
- The more apart the cultures, the higher impact on JP
- Good ties and familiarity with structures & cultural environment help
- ‘Trust’ and ‘flexibility’ are keywords
- Educational differences reduced by inclusion in EHEA (implementation of Bologna principles)
Conclusions/2

- EMMC: high level of integration (EMMC rules!) but remains a European concept, with low impact of non-European partners (so far) -> what will happen to the consortia, and the non-European partners when the money dries up?
- Bilateral JP’s and smaller consortia tackle issues easier > pragmatic approach
- ‘Global mobility’ in search for scholarships for non-European AND for European students alike
- Preference to ‘a little to everybody’ instead of ‘a lot to few’!
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