



Co-funded by
the European Union



Deliverable 4 (D2.1.)

EUROSUD Report of Quantitative & Qualitative Analysis

December 2023



SMARTT (Screening, mapping, analyzing, recommending, transferring and transforming HE international programmes)

Project number	101114590-SMARTT-ERASMUS-EDU-2022-POL-EXP-HE
Delivery date	31 December 2023
Document title	EUROSUD Report of Quantitative & Qualitative Analysis
Lead beneficiary	UB
WP number	WP2
No. of pages	44
Author(s)	Romiță IUCU, Simona IFTIMESCU, Angela MELLEY, Alexandru CARȚIȘ
Contributors	Nadia FERNÁNDEZ DE PINEDO, Susannah VERNEY, Mattea CAPELLI, Sophia PAPAIOANNOU, George GUNNESCH-LUCA

The report can be cited as follows:

Iucu, R., Iftimescu, S., Melley, A., & Carțiș, A. (2023). *EUROSUD Report of Quantitative & Qualitative Analysis. Deliverable D2.1.* CIVIS, Europe's Civic University Alliance. SMARTT project. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10444510>



**Co-funded by
the European Union**



ABOUT THE SMARTT PROJECT

SMARTT is an innovative project aiming at analysing, testing, and piloting the new European Degree label criteria, improving the quality, and increasing the transferability of future developments of European Degrees across Europe and beyond.

SMARTT is formed by the **CIVIS - Europe's Civic University Alliance** in cooperation with the European Universities Alliances EUTOPIA, NEUROTECHEU, and UNITA, alongside higher education institutions, national and regional stakeholders, and relevant actors. Based on significant experience in designing and delivering joint and multiple degree programmes at transnational level, the higher education institutions involved in the SMARTT project propose to expand this experience and draw, based on clear methodologies and thorough analyses, recommendations, and proposals both for the European Commission and the member states, to support the development of a European Approach for designing and implementing Joint European Degrees in the future. The consortium partners possess an extensive history of successful international collaboration and have consistently played a leading role in the co-development of the European Degree policy initiative since its inception.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report (**Deliverable 4**) is part of Work Package 2 and reflects the methodology, instruments, and the dataset including quantitative and qualitative data gathered in the first part of the project implementation (April – November 2023). The data presented in this report reflects the piloting phase of the project, aimed at validating the European Degree Label against EUROSUD (while the in-depth analysis is presented in **Deliverable 12**).

The SMARTT project is co-Funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union under Grant Agreement N101114590. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Co-funded by
the European Union

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	5
1.1. Specific objectives of the SMARTT project.....	6
1.2. Specific objectives of Work Package 2	6
METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	8
2.1. Introduction.....	9
2.2. Methodology and instruments.....	9
2.2.1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group	9
2.2.2. Interviews with EUROSUD team-members.....	10
2.2.3. Focus-groups with students and alumni of EUROSUD	13
2.2.4. Programme selection questionnaire	16
2.2.5. The SMARTT survey (pre-test).....	26
DATASET	32
3.1. EUROSUD Data	33
3.1.1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group	33
3.1.2. Interviews with EUROSUD team-members.....	38
3.1.3. Focus-groups with students and alumni of EUROSUD	39
3.1.4. Programme selection questionnaire	39
3.1.5. The SMARTT survey (pre-test).....	41

1

OVERVIEW

1. OVERVIEW

For this Deliverable, the report will comprise a general presentation of the specific objectives of the SMARTT project and of the WP2, a general approach and methodological framework used to analyse EUROSUD in the pilot stage, as well as a general presentation of the instruments used in collecting the data. The report will also include the data for EUROSUD. The in-depth analysis of this first phase in the SMARTT project will be presented in Deliverable 12 (Report EUROSUD).

1.1. Specific objectives of the SMARTT project

- **Mapping the different regulations** and goals at the national and European levels.
- **Establishing a catalogue of indicators for European criteria.**
 - Proposing an approach that could be **commonly agreed** on for the delivery of joint degrees based on co-created European criteria by European countries at all education levels.
 - **Testing** the relevance of these criteria.
 - Conducting a **joint reflection** on possible scenarios for the delivery of a joint degree at all levels, based on these co-created European criteria.
 - Exploring and recommending possible **optimization** of the proposed set of criteria.
 - Sharing **good practices** at all levels.
- Organizing a **large dissemination** event and elaborating materials.

1.2. Specific objectives of Work Package 2

1. Analyse the extent to which the specific criteria outlined in the European Degree Label¹ align with the EUROSUD program, determine the degree of compliance, and identify areas of alignment or potential gaps.
2. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the European Degree Label in relation to the EUROSUD program.
3. Gather diverse perspectives from stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, management team, experts, and external stakeholders, regarding the alignment of the European Degree Label criteria with the EUROSUD.
4. Contribute to the ongoing development and optimization of the European Degree Label by using the EUROSUD program as a benchmark.
5. Provide evidence-based insights to inform decision-making processes regarding the alignment of the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label.
6. Validate the relevance of the European Degree Label criteria in the context of the EUROSUD program.
7. Assess whether the criteria effectively capture the essential elements required for a high-quality joint degree program and provide feedback on their applicability.

¹ For clarity, the European Degree Label will be referred to as EDL throughout the document.

8. Evaluate the potential benefits of aligning the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label criteria. Determine how the alignment can enhance the value, recognition, and credibility of the program among students, stakeholders, and external entities.

2

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Methodology and instruments

2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

2.1. Introduction

The first stage of the SMARTT project (April – November 2023) focused on EUROSUD as a case-study. During this stage, we carried out an iterative process, each step building on the previous and ensuring flexibility. Moreover, we built a methodology to allow us a systematic approach throughout. Despite having specific plans for both WP2 and WP3, a series of steps were carried out in parallel, as to ensure coherence of the overall approach and allow for the results of the EUROSUD pre-testing to be integrated in the testing of the 50+ CIVIS and partners' programs.

The process included the following steps:

1. **Pre-Test alignment:** We conducted a pre-test of the EUROSUD program. The aim was to assess its alignment against the European Degree Label criteria. Through this preliminary assessment, we could identify both areas of alignment and potential gaps that may exist.
2. **Criteria review:** To ensure clarity in the assessment process, we reviewed the established criteria and their associated descriptors. This step involved defining explicit indicators that would serve as benchmarks for the assessment.
3. **Expert engagement:** To enhance the credibility and depth of our approach, we actively engaged two key groups: the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group. Their role was invaluable in offering insights and feedback which would shape the trajectory of our project.

2.2. Methodology and instruments

Throughout this process, we employed a range of methods and instruments, which included, among several informal discussions and formal meetings and conferences:

1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group
2. Interviews with EUROSUD team-members
3. Focus-groups with students and alumni of EUROSUD
4. A programme selection questionnaire
5. The SMARTT survey (pre-test)

The following section comprises the detailed presentation of the processes and instruments used during this first stage of the SMARTT project.

2.2.1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group

The objectives of engaging the Core Experts and Enlarged Experts working groups were to:

- O1.** Develop a **SMARTT vision** for the European Label **criteria**.
- O2.** Develop a **SMARTT proposal** for the **revised European label criteria**.
- O3.** Propose methods for applying the **SMARTT evaluation indicators**.
- O4.** **Identify, define, and describe** the corresponding SMARTT evaluation indicators.

The workshops and working groups' sessions were carried out both online and in person, starting with the first Core Experts Group meeting taking place during the 4-5th May 2023 Project kick-off meeting in Glasgow and with the Enlarged Experts Group taking place online on the 7th of June 2023. A shared working area was created on Google Drive and communication was carried out with representatives of both groups throughout the process. In the beginning, the Core Experts Group comprised 14 members and the Enlarged Experts Group 21 members. However, given the increased interest manifested from different representatives of CIVIS and partner institutions, the Enlarged Experts Group benefitted from input from 70+ experts. Workshops and working groups' sessions have been carried out monthly or on a case-by-case basis throughout the entire first stage of the SMARTT project.

The working procedure entailed several steps, ranging from (re)defining the criteria, identifying the key dimensions (areas to be measures), determining the potential data sources that could provide the information needed to measure the criteria), developing indicators, assessing their usefulness, testing, and refining, piloting the indicators on the EUROSUD program, transposing the indicators in the programme selection questionnaire. Several drafts were created and continuously revised based on feedback and experts' feedback and input. Experts' contributions were made both on a cluster level (as the criteria was structured into clusters) and on a general level, also addressing potential obstacles in the implementation of the EDL, as well as recommendations for its development and deployment.

2.2.2. Interviews with EUROSUD team-members

Interviews with the EUROSUD team-members were carried out along with informal formal conversations throughout this first stage of the process. A detailed description of the interviews is presented below.

A. General description of the interviews:

The interviews for EUROSUD team-members aim **to gather insights and perspectives from the individuals involved in the management and implementation of the EUROSUD programme**. These interviews provide an opportunity to explore the alignment of the criteria outlined in the European Degree Label with the EUROSUD program.

The interviews focus on gathering insights regarding the management of the EUROSUD program, coordination among partner institutions, student recruitment and support, curriculum development, quality assurance processes, and any future development plans in the context of the European Degree Label criteria.

The interviews were conducted individually, allowing each team-member to provide their input, reflections, and suggestions. The duration of each interview was estimated to be approximately **45 minutes**, depending on the interviewee's availability.

It is important to note that participation in the interview is voluntary, and all information shared during the discussion will be treated with strict confidentiality. The session was recorded for reference purposes only, ensuring accurate capture of participants' ideas and viewpoints. However, individual identities will remain anonymous.

B. Interview objectives:

1. Explore the team-members' **understanding of the European Degree Label** and its criteria.

2. Determine the extent to which the EUROSUD program **currently aligns** with the European Degree Label criteria, identifying areas of strength and potential gaps or areas for improvement.
3. Explore the team-members' perspectives on the **potential benefits and advantages** of aligning the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label, considering the impact on program reputation, student opportunities, and stakeholder engagement.
4. Identify **challenges and obstacles** that may arise during the alignment process and gather insights on **possible solutions or strategies** to address them effectively.
5. Gather **recommendations** from team-members on how to further align the European Degree Label criteria to the EUROSUD program.

C. Structure of the interviews:

To ensure consistency and reliability, a similar set of questions will be used for each interview.

1. Background:

- a. A brief overview of the SMARTT project and its objectives, as well as its connection to the EUROSUD program.
- b. The European Degree Label and its purpose in promoting joint degree programs.
- c. The aim of this discussion is to gather interviewees' perspectives on the European Degree Label in the context of the EUROSUD program.

2. Role of interviewee:

Gathering information about the interviewee's background, their role in the EUROSUD program, and their areas of expertise.

3. Program Overview:

Exploring the processes involved in implementing the EUROSUD program, including coordination among partner institutions, administrative procedures, and decision-making mechanisms etc.

4. European Degree Label Criteria:

Exploring the interviewee's understanding and interpretation of the European Degree Label criteria and its relevance to the EUROSUD program.

5. Alignment Validation:

Validating the degree to which the European Label Criteria currently aligns with the EUROSUD program, examining the different clusters and criteria in detail.

6. Strengths and Challenges:

Identifying the strengths and areas of alignment between the European Degree Label criteria and the EUROSUD program, as well as any challenges or gaps that may exist.

7. Enhancing Alignment:

Discussing strategies and recommendations to further enhance the alignment of the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label criteria.

8. Conclusion:

- a. Thank the interviewee for their valuable input and participation in the interview.
- b. Reiterate the importance of their perspectives in shaping the EUROSUD program and its alignment with the European Degree Label.
- c. Provide any additional information regarding the next steps in incorporating the European Degree Label criteria into the EUROSUD program and how the interviewee can stay informed about its progress.

Introduction:

Thank you for participating in this interview. The purpose of this session is to gather your insights and perspectives as a member of the EUROSUD team regarding the European Degree Label in the context of the SMARTT project. We aim to explore your understanding of the European Degree Label, its criteria, and how it relates to the EUROSUD program. The information you provide will contribute to our efforts to align the European Degree Label with the program and enhance its recognition.

The interview will last approximately 45 minutes. With your permission, the session will be recorded for reference and analysis purposes only. Please note that your responses will remain confidential and anonymous unless you provide consent for attribution.

Questions

1. Can you briefly describe your role within the EUROSUD team and your involvement with the EUROSUD program?
2. How familiar are you with the European Degree Label and its criteria?
 - a. Can you provide a brief overview of your understanding of it?
3. Based on your understanding of the European Degree Label criteria clusters, which ones do you think are most relevant and applicable to the EUROSUD program?
 - a. Can you provide examples of how the program meets specific criteria?
4. What are your initial thoughts regarding the implementation of the European Degree Label criteria in the EUROSUD program?
5. In your opinion, is it important for the EUROSUD program to align with the European Degree Label?
 - a. How can it benefit the program, students, and other stakeholders?
6. In your experience, what challenges might arise in aligning the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label criteria?
 - a. What potential solutions or strategies can be considered?
7. What are your recommendations or suggestions for further aligning the European Degree Label with the EUROSUD program?

- a. How can the European Degree Label evolve to better meet the EUROSUD program provisions?
8. Is there anything else you would like to share regarding the European Degree Label in relation to the EUROSUD program?

Note: This interview guide provides a framework for the discussion, and follow-up questions or prompts may be introduced based on the interviewee's responses to delve deeper into specific areas of interest or expertise.

2.2.3. Focus-groups with students and alumni of EUROSUD

A detailed description of the planned focus-groups is presented below.

A. General description of the focus-group:

The focus group is an interactive and collaborative discussion session that aims **to gather the perspectives and insights of students enrolled in the EUROSUD program regarding the European Degree Label and its relevance**. This session provides an opportunity for students to share their thoughts, experiences, and recommendations on how the European Degree Label criteria align with the EUROSUD program.

During the focus group, participants will engage in open and honest conversations facilitated by a moderator. The session will explore various aspects of the European Degree Label, including its criteria clusters, potential benefits, challenges, and implications for the EUROSUD program. Students' perspectives on the existing alignment between the EUROSUD program and the European Degree Label will be sought, as well as their suggestions for further improvement.

The focus group will be a safe and respectful environment where participants can express their opinions and contribute to the ongoing development of the EUROSUD program. **The session will be conducted online, and it will last approximately 1 hour.**

It is important to note that participation in the focus group is voluntary, and all information shared during the discussion will be treated with strict confidentiality. The session may be recorded for reference purposes only, ensuring accurate capture of participants' ideas and viewpoints. However, individual identities will remain anonymous.

B. Focus-group objectives:

1. Explore students' understanding and familiarity with the European Degree Label and its criteria.
2. Gather students' perspectives on the relevance and importance of the European Degree Label within the context of the EUROSUD program.
3. Identify students' perceptions of the potential benefits and challenges associated with implementing the European Degree Label criteria in the EUROSUD program.
4. Assess students' expectations and suggestions regarding the alignment of the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label criteria.
5. Obtain feedback on how well the EUROSUD program currently addresses the European Degree Label criteria and identify areas for improvement.

6. Explore students' experiences and examples of how the EUROSUD program already aligns with the European Degree Label criteria.
7. Encourage students to share their recommendations and suggestions for enhancing the EUROSUD program's alignment with the European Degree Label.
8. Gain insights into how the European Degree Label can contribute to improving the quality and recognition of the EUROSUD program.
9. Provide an opportunity for students to discuss their expectations and concerns regarding the implementation of the European Degree Label criteria.
10. Contribute to the ongoing development and optimization of the EUROSUD program by incorporating student perspectives on the European Degree Label and the SMARTT project.

C. Structure of the focus-group:

1. Background:

- d. A brief overview of the SMARTT project and its objectives, as well as its connection to the EUROSUD program.
- e. The European Degree Label and its purpose in promoting joint degree programs.
- f. The aim of this discussion is to gather students' perspectives on the European Degree Label in the context of the EUROSUD program.

2. Understanding the European Degree Label:

- a. The European Degree Label criteria clusters outlined in the SMARTT project (refer to the provided information).
- b. Familiarity with the European Degree Label and its specific criteria.
- c. Initial thoughts or perceptions of the European Degree Label and its potential impact on their academic journey.

3. Relevance to the EUROSUD Program:

- a. The European Degree Label alignment with the goals and values of the EUROSUD program.
- b. Students' perspectives on the specific European Degree Label criteria clusters and their relevance to the EUROSUD program.
- c. Students' expectations regarding the implementation of the European Degree Label criteria in the EUROSUD program.

4. Benefits and Challenges:

- a. Potential benefits of implementing the European Degree Label criteria in the EUROSUD program.
- b. Concerns or challenges that students anticipate in meeting the European Degree Label criteria.
- c. Possible strategies or initiatives that could help overcome these challenges and maximize the benefits of the European Degree Label.

5. Enhancing Quality and Recognition:

- a. The European Degree Label potential contribution to enhancing the quality and recognition of the EUROSUD program.
- b. Students' perspectives on how the European Degree Label can strengthen the program's reputation and improve opportunities for graduates.
- c. Specific actions or improvements that can be implemented to align the EUROSUD program with the European Degree Label criteria effectively.

6. Student Experiences and Feedback:

- a. Students' reflection on their experiences within the EUROSUD program and feedback on how well the program currently addresses the European Degree Label criteria.
- b. Specific examples or instances where the EUROSUD program already aligns with the European Degree Label criteria or where improvements could be made.
- c. Suggestions or recommendations for further enhancing the EUROSUD program's alignment with the European Degree Label.

7. Conclusion:

- a. Thank the students for their valuable input and participation in the focus group discussion.
- b. Reiterate the importance of their perspectives in shaping the EUROSUD program and its alignment with the European Degree Label.
- c. Provide any additional information regarding the next steps in incorporating the European Degree Label criteria into the EUROSUD program and how the students can stay informed about its progress.

Introduction:

Thank you for participating in this focus group discussion. The purpose of this session is to gather your thoughts and insights regarding the European Degree Label and its significance in the context of the EUROSUD program. We aim to understand how the European Degree Label can enhance the EUROSUD program and its joint degree offerings. The discussion will last approximately 1 hour, and your input will greatly contribute to the ongoing development of the program and of the European Degree Label in the context of the SMARTT project.

Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and we encourage open and honest responses. With your permission, the session will be recorded for reference and analysis purposes only. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained.

Questions

1. What has been/was your EUROSUD experience like?
 - a. What were the main reasons you chose this programme?
2. How familiar are you with the European Degree Label and its criteria?
 - a. Can you briefly explain your understanding of it?

3. In your opinion, how important is the European Degree Label in the context of the EUROSUD program?
 - a. How do you think it can benefit you and other students?
4. What are your initial thoughts or concerns regarding the implementation of the European Degree Label criteria in the EUROSUD program?
5. Based on your understanding of the European Degree Label criteria clusters, which ones do you think are most relevant and applicable to the EUROSUD program?
 - a. Why?
6. Can you provide examples of how the EUROSUD program already aligns with any of the European Degree Label criteria?
 - a. Are there any areas where improvements can be made?
7. Do you think the implementation of the European Degree Label criteria can enhance the quality and recognition of the EUROSUD program?
 - a. What specific aspects or benefits do you anticipate?
8. What potential challenges do you foresee in meeting the European Degree Label criteria within the EUROSUD program?
 - a. How do you think these challenges can be addressed or overcome?
9. How well do you think the EUROSUD program currently addresses the European Degree Label criteria?
 - a. Are there any areas where the program could better reflect the criteria?
10. How do you believe the European Degree Label and the implementation of its criteria can impact your academic journey and future career prospects?
11. Is there anything else you would like to share or any additional suggestions you have regarding the EUROSUD program's alignment with the European Degree Label criteria?

Note: This focus-group guide provides a framework for the discussion, and follow-up questions or prompts may be introduced based on the participants' responses to delve deeper into specific areas of interest or expertise.

2.2.4. Programme selection questionnaire

The programme selection questionnaire was aimed at validating the European Degree Label criteria against the selected CIVIS and partners' programs. Apart from being used as a selection tool for programs that would later participate in the SMARTT survey, the selection questionnaire also allowed us to map the existing programs in CIVIS in relation to the EDL.

Objectives:

1. Provide evidence-based insights to inform decision-making processes regarding the EDL.
2. Evaluate the extent to which the European Degree Label (EDL) criteria aligns with the selected programs.
3. Validate the relevance of the EDL criteria in the context of the selected programs.
4. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of each EDL criterion/cluster in relation to the selected programs.

5. Identify opportunities to better align program elements and the EDL criteria to further improve the quality of education and student experiences.
6. Identify best practices and lessons learned from selected joint degree programs or initiatives that can inform the EDL.
7. Provide feedback on the applicability of the EDL criteria in the context of the selected programs.
8. Identify the potential benefits of better aligning the selected programs and the EDL criteria.
9. Identify the potential drawbacks of better aligning the selected programs and the EDL criteria.
10. Explore attitudes and perception of CIVIS members and partners with regards to the EDL.

Approach:

The programmes will **be selected from:**

- the CIVIS alliance (a minimum of 50 programmes)
- other partner alliances (depending on nominations)

This specific programme selection process will only be undertaken within CIVIS, while the other alliances will either fill out the questionnaire or nominate the programmes based on their internal selection process.

The types of programs that will be included in the selection process are as follows:

- Joint Degrees
- Double Degrees
- Multiple Degrees
- Other types of degree, if deemed relevant

The coordinator/programme manager will also have to specify the field of study in which the programme falls. The types included in the survey are Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics- STEM; Social Science; Humanities; Arts; Health.

Arts	Fashion, interior and industrial design
	Fine Arts
	Handcrafts
	Music and Performing Art
Humanities	Religion and theology
	History and Archaeology
	Philosophy and ethics
	Language acquisition
	Literature and linguistics
	Finance, banking, and insurance
	Marketing and advertising
	Management and administration
	Law

Social Sciences	Economics
	Educational Sciences
	Political Science and Civics
	Psychology
	Sociology and cultural studies
	Journalism and reporting
	Library, information, and archival studies
STEM	Biology
	Biochemistry
	Environmental science
	Chemistry
	Earth Sciences
	Physics
	Mathematics
	Statistics
	Computer Use
	Database and network design and administration
	Software and applications development and analysis
	Chemical engineering and processes
	Environmental protection technology
	Electricity and energy
	electronics and automation
	Mechanics and metal trades
	Motor vehicles, ships, and aircraft
	Architecture and town planning
	Building and civil engineering
	Agriculture
Forestry	
Fisheries	
Veterinary	
Health	Dental Studies
	Medicine
	Nursing and midwifery
	Medical diagnostic and treatment technology
	Pharmacy

The programme selection criteria **are based on:**

- the European Degree Label (EDL) criteria
- general standards for joint programmes²
- general-structural principles.

² Based on <https://impea.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Joint-Programmes-from-A-to-Z-Report-2020.pdf>

The entire selection and validation process will have a maximum duration of 3 months (July – September 2023) and will be developed in 3 operational phases, distinct albeit interconnected and consequential:

- **Phase 1:** Pre-selection of programs (31 July – 07 September 2023) (*for details see dedicated section*) subdivided into 3 intermediate steps:
 - a. **Development of the Survey Tool and of the Scoring System**
 - b. **Internal selection procedure**
 - c. **Results**
- **Phase 2:** Selection of programs (08 September – 30 September 2023) (*for details see dedicated section*).

Phase 1

The **objective** of this phase is the collection of all the programmes of the partner universities, out of which at least 50 programmes will be selected to be sent to the validation phase (case studies). **Responsible** for this phase will be Universidad Autonoma de Madrid (UAM) and Sapienza University of Rome (SUR), which will specifically deal with:

- Build the **methodological framework**:
 - a. creation of the **survey tool**: access available at a Google Form link
 - b. construction of the **scoring system** according to each of the **EDL Criteria**
 - c. **monitoring system** of the pre-selection procedure.
- **Directly involve partner universities** to update the list of programs available that will be part of the pre-selection phase:
 - a. involvement of **CIVIS partners**, who will send a minimum of 5 up to a maximum of 20 programs to be selected
 - b. send the survey tool to the **coordinators/programme managers** by sharing a Google Form link.

The pre-screening is not intended to create a hierarchy amongst existing programmes, but rather to provide support for the selection of relevant programmes that will help test and validate the EDL criteria. In other words, the EDL criteria are being tested, not the programmes.

The Survey Tool and the Scoring System (3-31 July 2023)

To facilitate the program selection process, in an ex-ante phase to that of pre-selection, the SUR team, in agreement with UAM, will elaborate the survey tool (**the online questionnaire**):

- a. the questionnaire will have a twofold structure (*see Draft checklist for program selection*):
 - i. **general and structural information** on the home university and on the active partnerships: open-ended and multiple-choice questions;
 - ii. questions on the **Presence or Absence of EDLs Criteria**: multiple choice questions with dichotomous modality (Yes/No);
- b. the platform used to fill out the questionnaire will be Google Forms;
- c. the expected duration for filling out the questionnaire will be approximately 10 minutes.

- d. UAM will send to each coordinator/programme manager the link to the questionnaire.
- e. the coordinators/managers will autonomously complete (self-administered) the questionnaire.

At the same time, SUR, in agreement with UAM, will finalise a **Scoring System**, whereby a score will be assigned for each response obtained by the coordinators on each criterion entered in the online questionnaire (see *Draft checklist for program selection*).

- Scores have been allocated to each single criterion as follows:

- i. for each of the **11 compulsory criteria**:

- +7 points (Yes)
- +0 points (No)

- ii. for the **9 optional criteria**:

- +1 or +2 or +3 points (Yes)
- +0 points (No)

for a maximum of 100 points.

- iii. further structural-general criteria that guarantee evidence also about the

- proportional representation of Universities
- different geographical distribution
- types of programmes
- fields of study
- partnership number and Country/ies

to which will be assigned a score (to be agreed with partner universities) or which will be only taken into consideration.

List of criteria and proposed scores:

Compulsory criterion	Score	Optional criterion	Score
Higher education institutions involved	7	In addition to physical mobility, the joint programme (JP) includes additional formats of transnational learning activities with partner higher education institutions.	3
Transnational joint degree delivery	7	The JP offers the possibility to take language classes so as to enhance the command of multiple European languages.	1
Transparency of the learning outcomes	7	The JP includes components and actions related to environmental sustainability and implements measures to minimise the environmental footprint of its activities.	2
Quality assurance arrangements	7	The JP includes components and actions related to the development of high-level digital skills of students, it offers high-quality digital education content, as well as assessment of student skills.	3

Compulsory criterion	Score	Optional criterion	Score
Joint policies for the joint programme	7	The JP offers the possibility for students to participate in activities promoting democratic values and addressing societal needs of the local community(ies), including volunteering, and to receive ECTS for it.	2
Transnational campus – access to services	7	The JP supports future labour market needs and/or includes cooperation with businesses and sectors in its curriculum	3
Flexible and embedded student mobility arrangements	7	The JP provides opportunities for international professional internships/work-based learning recognised through the award of ECTS	3
Multilingualism	7	The JP includes a career development plan devised with the candidate and/or exposure to the non-academic sector	3
Innovative learning approaches	7	The higher education institutions offering the joint study programme conducts joint promotion and awareness-raising activities to ensure visibility of the joint programme.	3
Graduate outcomes	7		
Inclusiveness and sustainability	7		

Checklist/questionnaire for programme selection:

Cluster/ category	Criterion	Criterion for selection	Answer	Score
General-Structural	Type of programme	Joint programme	Yes/No	
		Double degrees	Yes/No	
		Multiple degrees	Yes/No	
		EMJM	Yes/No filter question (If Yes) Country/ies open question	
	Field of studies	STEM	Yes/No	
		Social Sciences	Yes/No	
		Humanities	Yes/No	
		Arts	Yes/No	
		Health	Yes/No	
	Timeframe	Planned OR in process of accreditation	Yes/No	
		Implemented for less than 6 months	Yes/No	
		Implemented for more than 6 months	Yes/No	
	Funding	Organisational	Yes/No	
		European	Yes/No	
		Third parties (companies etc.)	Yes/No	

Cluster/ category	Criterion	Criterion for selection	Answer	Score
		Mixed	Yes/No	
	Other	Name of partner university	Drop down list	
		Country	Drop down list	
		Name of coordinator	open field	
		Email address coordinator	open field	
		Agreements with non CIVIS countries	Yes/No filter question	
		Number of agreements with non CIVIS countries	(If Yes) open question	
		Partner countries	(If Yes) open question	
I. Structural: Transnational Cooperation	1. Higher education institutions involved	Involvement of at least 2 higher education institutions from at least 2 different EU Member states OR from at least 2 different states, one from the EU	Yes/No	3,5/0
		The joint programme has an integrated curriculum	Yes/No	3,5/0
	2. Transnational joint degree delivery	The joint programme leads to the award of a joint degree or multiple degrees	Yes/No	3,5/0
		Evaluation of learning outcomes is done by representatives from at least 2 different institutions located in 2 different countries	Yes/No	3,5
	5. Joint policies for the joint programme	The involved HEIs have a joint policy for admission	Yes/No	1,12
		The involved HEIs have a joint policy for selection	Yes/No	1,12
		The involved HEIs have a joint policy for supervision	Yes/No	1,12
		The involved HEIs have a joint policy for monitoring	Yes/No	1,12
		The involved HEIs have a joint policy for assessment	Yes/No	1,12
		The involved HEIs have a joint recognition procedure	Yes/No	1,12
	6. Transnational campus – access to services	No specific admission requirements depending on students' location	Yes/No	0,78
		Students have free and easy access to IT services	Yes/No	0,78
		Students have free and easy access to shared infrastructure	Yes/No	0,78
		Students have free and easy access to library services	Yes/No	0,78
		Students have free and easy access to faculty development and support	Yes/No	0,78
		Students have free and easy access to academic guidance and psychological counselling	Yes/No	0,78
		Students have free and easy access to career advice/mentoring	Yes/No	0,78

Cluster/ category	Criterion	Criterion for selection	Answer	Score
		Students have free and easy access to alumni systems	Yes/No	0,78
	i. Visibility & awareness (optional)	The HEIs involved conduct joint promotion activities to ensure visibility	Yes/No	0,75
		The HEIs involved conduct joint awareness activities to ensure visibility	Yes/No	0,75
		The HEIs involved conduct joint activities to provide necessary information to students	Yes/No	0,75
		The HEIs involved conduct joint activities to provide necessary information to other relevant stakeholders (eg. Employers)	Yes/No	0,75
II. Functional: Labour Market & Employability	10. Graduate outcomes	The joint programme has a system to monitor graduate outcomes, either at the level of the programme or at the institutional level(s)	Yes/No	3,5
		The content is aligned to the survey content of EUROGRADUATE	Yes/No	3,5
	f. Cooperation with the labour market (optional)	The joint programme supports future labour market needs and/or includes cooperation with businesses and sectors in its curriculum	Yes/No	3
	g. Internships / work-based learning (optional)	The joint programme provides opportunities for international professional internships/work-based learning recognised through the award of ECTS	Yes/No	3
	h. Career development plan (optional)	The joint programme includes a career development plan devised with the candidate and/or exposure to the non-academic sector (such as internships, seminars, networking).	Yes/No	3
III. Qualitative: Student-Centred Teaching & Learning	3. Transparency of the learning outcomes	The joint programme is described in ECTS	Yes/No	3,5
		The joint programme issues a Joint Diploma Supplement	Yes/No	3,5
	4. Quality assurance mechanisms	Accredited programme	Yes/No	1,75
		Internal QA in accordance with ESG	Yes/No	1,75
		External QA in accordance with ESG	Yes/No	1,75
		European Approach for QA for Joint Programmes is used	Yes/No	1,75
	7. Flexible and embedded student mobility arrangements	The joint programme includes at least 1 period of student physical mobility at another partner institution of at least 30 ECTS	Yes/No	2,34
		The joint programme includes a total of at least 6 months of physical mobility at another partner institution (including secondment)	Yes/No	2,33
		The joint programme includes opportunities for doctoral candidates to participate in one	Yes/No	2,33

Cluster/ category	Criterion	Criterion for selection	Answer	Score	
		or more of these activities at another partner institution: teaching activities, international events, international conferences, joint research scientific projects between partner institutions, joint research publications with researchers from partner institutions			
	9. Innovative learning approaches	The joint programme includes embedded interdisciplinary and/or transdisciplinary student-centered and/or challenged-based approaches	Yes/No	3,5	
		The joint programme includes embedded inter-sectoral components using student-centered and/or challenged-based approaches	Yes/No	3,5	
	a. Alternative learning formats (optional)	The joint programme includes additional formats of transnational learning activities with partner higher education institutions (e.g., online or blended, in the format of regular or intensive courses, summer/winter schools)	Yes/No	3	
	d. Digital skills (optional)	The joint programme includes components and actions related to the development of high-level digital skills of students	Yes/No	1	
		The joint programme offers high quality digital education content	Yes/No	1	
		The joint programme offers assessment of student (digital) skills	Yes/No	1	
	IV. European Values: Inclusion & Sustainability	8. Multilingualism	During the joint programme, students are exposed to at least 2 different EU official languages (language classes excluded)	Yes/No	3,5
			Exposure to EU official languages in active and/or passive use of language(s), at any level in teaching and/or learning activities, examinations, research activities, professional or civic engagement activities and during mobility periods, including by going on mobility to a country where a different EU official language is predominantly used in daily life	Yes/No	3,5
		11. Inclusiveness & sustainability	The joint programme commits to wide participation through socially and geographically inclusive admission through tailored measures for all categories of disadvantaged students	Yes/No	3,5
The joint programme commits to respect the principles of the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers and commits to the principles of the MSCA Green Charter			Yes/No	3,5	

Cluster/ category	Criterion	Criterion for selection	Answer	Score
	b. Language classes (optional)	The joint programme offers the possibility to take language classes to enhance the command of multiple European languages	Yes/No	1
	c. Environmental care (optional)	The joint programme includes components and actions related to environmental sustainability	Yes/No	1
		The joint programme implements measures to minimise the environmental footprint of its activities	Yes/No	1
	e. Democratic values (optional)	The joint programme offers the possibility for students to participate in activities promoting democratic values and addressing societal needs of the local community (ies)	Yes/No	0,5
		The joint programme includes volunteering opportunities	Yes/No	0,5
		The joint programme offers the option for students to receive ECTS for these activities (volunteering, involvement in the local community, etc.)	Yes/No	1
	TOTAL			

Internal selection procedure

The team in charge of this phase (UAM) will have to ask the contact persons in each of the CIVIS partners for the programs to be included in the evaluation and draw up a complete list (Excel matrix). In particular:

- each CIVIS partner will have to select and send **a list of a maximum of 20 programmes**, indicating the name and e-mail address of the coordinators/programme managers;
- to ensure **a correct proportionality of proposed programs**, the partners will be asked to identify, independently and at their own discretion, a heterogeneity of the programs in order to guarantee a representativeness of all the Fields of studies and the Types of programmes;
- UAM/SUR will draw up the overall list and **send the link for completing the survey directly to each coordinator/programme manager**;
- the responses sent will automatically be entered into an **Excel matrix**.

During this process, SUR will be responsible for **the monitoring phase** aimed at guaranteeing:

- the correct entry of information in the matrix;
- reminders sent via e-mail aimed at the coordinators/programme managers, who will not have completed the survey while the deadline of the pre-selection phase is approaching:
 - a. send the questionnaire: 31 July 2023
 - b. first reminder: 28 August 2023
 - c. second reminder 4 September 2023
 - d. third reminder: 11 September 2023
 - e. fourth reminder: 14-15 September 2023.

Results

SUR, once the data collection phase has been completed:

- will download and clean the matrix automatically generated by Google, containing the answers of the single programs;
- the matrix will represent the basis (dataset) for the ascription of scores;
- a copy of the matrix and list will be shared with all CIVIS partners.

Phase 2

SUR/UAM will be responsible for this phase. Its aim is the selection of 50 programs (case studies) from a list (online matrix of cases by variables) automatically generated during the filling out of the questionnaires by the program coordinators/managers (pre-selection phase). Based on **the scoring scheme** (List of criteria) developed in **Phase I** (July 2023) in collaboration with UAM, the factors undergoing the assessment will be:

- **EDL criteria (compulsory and optional)**, inserted as indicators in the questionnaire sent to the coordinators/programme managers (pre-selection phase).
- other **general-structural information**.

The scores assigned for each criterion will not be immediately disclosed to the coordinators/programme managers so as not to affect the quality and truthfulness of data. Once the scoring phase has been completed, **a ranking list**, with all the pre-selected programmes including the single scores for each answer as well as the total score, will be drawn up and announced. The programs will be listed in a decreasing order of score up to the 50th place, including all those programs that are found to have the same score as the 50th. The duly signed Agreement of the investigated program will only be asked to the manager/coordinators of the 50 selected programmes through the email addresses of the managers (UAM), to guarantee the transparency of the information.

The complete ranking of the pre-selected programs will be discussed with the CEG to carry out a validation phase. Statistical and graphical reports will be presented during the EDL validation process throughout the 50 selected programs (and the programs nominated by the partner alliances) and WP3 coordinators (UAM and SUR).

2.2.5. The SMARTT survey (pre-test)

As previously mentioned, due to the iterative nature of the process, WP2 and WP3 overlapped (September – November), to ensure cohesion of the overall project. Therefore, the WP2 and WP3 leaders developed the general approach for the SMARTT survey, as well as the draft to allow for pre-testing on EUROSUD. The general approach and the draft survey are presented below, solely for the purpose of discussing the pre-testing on EUROSUD. The complete analysis of the survey in relation to the selected programmes will be presented in the final report.

Objectives

The survey is aimed at validating the European Degree Label criteria against the selected CIVIS and partners' programs:

1. Provide evidence-based insights to inform decision-making processes regarding the EDL.

2. Evaluate the extent to which the European Degree Label (EDL) criteria aligns with the selected programs.
3. Validate the relevance of the EDL criteria in the context of the selected programs.
4. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of each EDL criterion/cluster in relation to the selected programs.
5. Identify opportunities to better align program elements and the EDL criteria to further improve the quality of education and student experiences.
6. Identify best practices and lessons learned from selected joint degree programs or initiatives that can inform the EDL.
7. Provide feedback on the applicability of the EDL criteria in the context of the selected programs.
8. Identify the potential benefits of better aligning the selected programs and the EDL criteria.
9. Identify the potential drawbacks of better aligning the selected programs and the EDL criteria.
10. Explore attitudes and perception of CIVIS members and partners with regards to the EDL.

By addressing these objectives, the project aims to:

- provide a comprehensive assessment of the alignment between the selected programs and the EDL criteria,
- offer insights and recommendations for EDL development
- contribute to the continuous improvement of joint degree programs in higher education.

General approach

The survey is specifically addressed to representatives of the selected CIVIS and partners' programs. It aims to gather quantitative and qualitative data regarding the European Degree Label (EDL) criteria from the perspective of the selected programs. The purpose of the survey is to validate the EDL criteria through the perspective of the selected programs. The purpose of the survey is **NOT** that of evaluating the selected programs.

As the questionnaire used for the selection of the programs addressed the partial/full alignment of the programs with the EDL, the SMARTT survey attempts to analyse the EDL through specific criteria, attempting to identify its strong points and areas of improvement (while not duplicating the effort of the program selection questionnaire).

For clarity, the SMARTT survey will use the word 'descriptors' to refer to the EDL criteria.

Participants

- Representatives of EUROSUD (pre-testing)
- Representatives of the 50+ selected CIVIS programs (based on the selection procedure)
- Representatives of the project partners' selected programs (based on a nomination process).

The primary aim of this survey is to gather valuable insights into the application and relevance of the European Degree Label (EDL) criteria within existing joint degree programs. Through the responses, we seek to understand how the EDL criteria align with the specificities and objectives of selected programmes, and how these criteria might be refined or enhanced to better support the development and recognition of high-quality joint degree programs across Europe.

The survey can be filled out by representatives from all partner institutions participating in the selected or nominated joint degree programs. This will allow for an analysis of different perceptions of the EDL within the same program. However, for the final reporting purposes, results will be based on the program's main institutional coordinators' input.

To draft the SMARTT Survey, a series of meta-criteria were identified, which helped guide the survey questions: clarity, specificity, relevance, comprehensiveness, measurability, consistency, feasibility, differentiation, applicability, adaptability, alignment, ethics.

The survey sections were developed as follows:

1. Section 1: General information
2. Section 2: EDL criteria validation against the program
3. Section 3: Attitudes and Perceptions
4. Section 4: Final considerations

Insofar Section 3 is concerned, the survey uses a theoretical predictive framework based on Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen 1991)³. This section specifically looks at how attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control (PBC) affect the real and intended behaviours of important stakeholders when it comes to the adoption of EDL.

The full survey comprises of 10 open-ended questions and 54 questions with multiple choice responses on a five-point rating system.

- the first 12 and the last 2 questions refer to general information;
- 25 questions evaluate the participants' opinions about the EDL, based on 7 pre-established meta-criteria: clarity, relevance, specificity, measurability, flexibility, readiness, and consistency;
- 26 multiple-answer questions relate to the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) framework: 6 questions about Attitude (AT), 6 about Subjective Norms (SN), 9 about Perceived Behavioural Control (PBC), and 5 about Utilization Intention (UI).

The survey is distributed electronically using SoSci Survey⁴, a platform that ensures data privacy and ease of access for respondents. The initial versions of the SMARTT survey were presented in a workshop dedicated to both the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group and a preliminary version was made available for the experts to share their feedback and input. Also, representatives of EUROSUD provided feedback and filled-out the survey in a pre-test phase, allowing for preliminary results and input for a final version of the SMARTT Survey.

³ Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50(2), 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)

⁴ <https://www.soscisurvey.de/>

Survey

I. Section 1: General information:

For the name of the program, if available, please use the name used for marketing the program, not the specific national/institutional name:

1. Name of Program *[Text box for response]*
2. Coordinating partner/Partner: *[Text box for response]*
3. Partner Institutions Involved:
Name the full partner name, associated partners as well as their country of origin
 - 3.1 Full Partners: *[Text box for response]*
 - 3.1.a. Country of the full partner *[Text box for response]*
 - 3.2 Associated Partner: *[Text box for response]*
 - 3.2.a. Country of the full partner *[Text box for response]*
4. Any Other Relevant Program Information: *[Text box for response]*
5. May we reach out to you for additional inquiries regarding the survey?
 - 5.1. Name *[Text box for response]*
 - 5.2. Host institution *[Text box for response]*
 - 5.3. Role of the contact person *[Text box for response]*
 - 5.4. Email for the contact person *[Text box for response]*
 - 5.5. Telephone number *[Text box for response]*

II. Section 2: EDL criteria validation against the program

A. Clarity and Understanding of the EDL Criteria

Please rate the following aspects on a scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

1. The EDL criteria are clearly presented in the context of our program.
2. It is easy to understand the EDL criteria as they apply to our program.
3. The EDL criteria accurately convey their intended meanings and outcomes in our program's context.

B. Relevance and Alignment

4. The EDL criteria align well with our program's outcomes and goals.
5. The EDL is relevant in the context of our program.
6. The EDL criteria are applicable across different cultural and educational contexts, including international applicability.

C. Specificity and Detail

7. The EDL criteria provide detailed guidance specific to our program.
8. The EDL criteria comprehensively reflect the quality and standards of our program.
9. Which criteria are most relevant in the context of your program? *[Text box for response]*
10. Which criteria are least relevant in the context of your program? *[Text box for response]*
11. Are there obstacles in EDL's global/European applicability in the context of your program? *[Text box for response]*

D. Need for Adaptation and Reformulation

12. Are there elements within the EDL (criteria, clusters, indicators) that require reformulation for your program? *[Text box for response]*

13. Do you perceive any conflict between the criteria and existing quality assurance frameworks or standards in your program? *[Text box for response]*

E. Measurability and Distinctions

14. The EDL criteria are measurable within our program's context.
15. There should be clear distinctions between criteria that indicate higher and lower levels of attainment in relation to the EDL criteria.

F. Flexibility and Future Readiness

16. The EDL criteria are flexible in adapting to future changes in education, technology, and societal needs.
17. Implementing the EDL is feasible in the context of our program.

G. Consistency with Broader Goals and Values

18. The criteria are consistent with broader goals at various levels (institutional, accreditation body, national, European, etc.).
19. The EDL criteria align well with the expectations of different stakeholders (students, employers, etc.).
20. The criteria are consistent with the values of fairness, transparency, and integrity in the context of our program.
21. The criteria will significantly contribute to enhancing the reputation and value of our program.

H. Impact Assessment

22. Identify the main resources in implementing the EDL within your program. *[Text box for response]*
23. What are the key strengths of the EDL as they pertain to your program? *[Text box for response]*
24. Provide your recommendations for enhancing the EDL. *[Text box for response]*

III. Section 3: Attitudes and Perceptions

Tell us how you feel towards the European Degree Label. Rate the following on a scale from 1 to 5 where:

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

Attitude *(This component assesses personal attitudes towards the behaviour)*

1. The EDL is valuable in promoting and recognizing high-quality joint/multiple degree programs.
2. Adopting the EDL will significantly contribute to the educational excellence of our program.
3. It is important for our program to align with the EDL criteria.
4. Aligning our program with the EDL criteria fits well with our long-term educational goals.
5. Obtaining the EDL would be a competitive advantage for our program.
6. Obtaining the EDL will significantly benefit our program.

Subjective Norms *(This component measures perceived social pressures or norms)*

7. Our stakeholders (faculty, students, alumni) encourage alignment with the EDL.
8. There is a general expectation from the wider educational community that programs like ours should align with the EDL.
9. Our program team collectively believes that aligning with the EDL is important.
10. Our program team would recommend other relevant programs to pursue the EDL.

11. The decision of other similar programs to pursue the EDL influences our decision to do the same.
12. Most similar programs perceive the EDL positively and see it as beneficial.

Perceived Behavioural Control (This component evaluates perceived control over the behaviour)

13. As a program team, we are familiar with the EDL framework and its descriptors.
14. Implementing the criteria required for the EDL in our program would be manageable.
15. We are confident in our ability to meet the requirements for obtaining the EDL.
16. We perceive the process of obtaining the EDL for our program as challenging.
17. We have sufficient resources to successfully align our program with the EDL.
18. We have access to adequate guidance and support for the EDL application process.
19. Our program team is capable of overcoming challenges that may arise in the process of aligning with the EDL.
20. Our program team feels motivated and committed to ensuring our program obtains the EDL.
21. The requirements of the EDL align well with our current program practices and policies.

EDL Utilisation Intent (This component evaluates intention to act towards EDL utilisation)

22. Our program is planning to apply for the EDL when available.
23. We are committed to integrating and upholding the EDL criteria in our program, irrespective of the formal pursuit of the label.
24. Regardless of the status, our program intends to align with the EDL criteria in the future.
25. Obtaining or aligning with the EDL will be a priority in our program's strategic planning.
26. Our program actively advocates for and recommends the adoption of the EDL to other similar programs.

IV. Section 4: Final considerations

27. Could you share any best practices or lessons learned from your program that you believe could inform the development or refinement of the EDL?
28. Is there any additional feedback or comments you would like to provide regarding the EDL and its criteria?

3

DATASET

EUROSUD Data

3. DATASET

3.1. EUROSUD Data

This section will present the existing data collected through the instruments previously described. In the case of qualitative data, to preserve the anonymity of respondents (as indicated in the interview/focus-group guides), a preliminary analysis was carried out. In the case of quantitative data, this will be presented as raw data, under the generic label of `EUROSUD`. The data will be presented following the structure of the previous chapter. The in-depth analysis and outputs are further detailed in Deliverable 12.

3.1.1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group

Analysis of the EDL criteria validation against the program, following the cluster structure and the initial draft indicators⁵.

Cluster	Criterion	Indicators	EUROSUD
I. Structural: Transnational Cooperation	I.1. Higher education institutions involved	The joint programme is jointly designed and delivered by at least 2 higher education institutions from at least 2 different EU Member States.	YES: NKUA, UAM, AMU, LUISS, UoG are all HEIs and NKUA, UAM, AMU and LUISS are based in the respective EU states: Greece, Spain, France, and Italy.
	I.2. Transnational joint degree delivery	The joint programme leads to the award of a joint degree or multiple degrees.	YES: Where national policy allows (in EUROSUD this is possible with all partners except the French partner (AMU) due to parchment requirements). The basic model is that three partners award the joint degree or double degree (when AMU is an awarding partner) depending on where the student spends three different mobility periods: semesters 1, 2 and 3 & 4 (together) over the 2yr period.
		Dissertations are co-evaluated by supervisors or a committee with members from at least 2 different institutions located in 2 different countries.	YES: Dissertations are jointly supervised with primary and two secondary supervisors / markers from different partners. This is necessary to enable all three-degree awarding partners to award the degree (i.e. sharing in dissertation supervision and assessment credits, which is a stipulated regulation for all partners).
	I.3. Joint policies for the joint programme	The higher education institutions involved have joint policies for admission, selection, supervision, monitoring, assessment, and recognition procedures for the joint study programme.	Yes: the coordinating partner (UoG) manages application processing, using entry criteria which all partners have agreed. See text below
			Yes: assessment is managed by the consortium through an agreed grading equivalents table.
			Yes: joint recognition is managed through the various national accreditation procedures whereby each partner's HEI status, regulations, credits delivered, and QA procedures are recognised by the other degree-awarding partners. These procedures are laid out in the consortium agreement.

⁵ Following the analysis, these initial indicators were further refined and restructured to better reflect the corresponding criteria.

Cluster	Criterion	Indicators	EUROSUD
	I.4. Transnational campus – access to services	The joint programme provides enrolled students, regardless of their location when allowed, with seamless and free access to the participating HEI's services such as e.g., IT services, shared infrastructure, and facilities, (online) library services, faculty development and support, academic guidance and psychological counselling, career advice/mentoring, alumni systems.	YES (in relation to UoG only): EUROSUD students are enrolled at UoG (the coordinating partner) for the full two years of the programme, irrespective of where the students are based for their mobility periods, and they have access to all services throughout the two years [both academic and non-academic services].
	I.5. Visibility & awareness (optional)	The higher education institutions offering the joint study programme conducts joint promotion and awareness-raising activities to ensure visibility of the joint programme and provide the necessary information about it for students and other relevant stakeholders such as future employers.	EUROSUD students are enrolled at the other partners only for the period they are based there (eg semester 2 in year 1 or year 2 (semesters 3&4). This is because of registration requirements of the partners. YES: EUROSUD is jointly promoted by all partners on their own websites and through the bespoke EUROSUD website and social media. Employers played a consultation role in the initial market research when the joint programme was being designed in 2016/17 and take part in periodic evaluation of the programme.
II. Functional: Labour Marker & Employability	II.1. Graduate outcomes	The joint programme has a system to monitor graduate outcomes. This system can be at the level of the programme or institutional level(s). If possible, the content is aligned to the survey content of EUROGRADUATE.	YES: EUROSUD runs two annual Surveys upon the graduation of each cohort (Graduate Survey). There is one anonymous survey that requests information about students' experience with the programme and a second eponymous survey that requests information about current and future internships/employment as well as contact details and willingness to be involved with the programme in future as Alumni. The content is aligned to EUROGRADUATE. EUROSUD also has a Linked-in page for students and Alumni.
	II.2. Cooperation with the labour market (optional)	The joint programme supports future labour market needs and/or includes cooperation with businesses and sectors in its curriculum.	YES: EUROSUD trains experts of the South European Region for which there is rising labour market demand. Few examples: EUROSUD graduates have become employed as foreign correspondents, diplomats, consultants, researchers, policy analysts and project managers because of their South European Region area expertise. YES: EUROSUD engages in co-operation and dialogue with professionals from various sectors through its Professional Track programme and the Lisbon Winter School. Representatives of industry and the third sector are invited to give talks to students and sit on its External International Advisory Board (EIAB)
	II.3. Internships / work-based learning (optional)	The joint programme provides opportunities for international professional internships/work-based learning recognised through the award of ECTS	YES: EUROSUD has at least one placement opportunity during the 2-year programme with the option to deliver a research project/report or research dissertation, depending on the Study Track chosen by the student. Depending on the partner, these may or may not be credit-bearing.
		The joint programme includes a career development plan	YES: Mentoring Sessions take place individually with each student across partners, whose

Cluster	Criterion	Indicators	EUROSUD
	II.4. Career development plan (optional)	devised with the candidate and/or exposure to the non-academic sector (such as internships, seminars, networking).	purpose is partly to discuss career plans and offer advice. YES: students are exposed to the non-academic sector frequently, through internships, professional talks, and seminars. Employability and career sessions are organised for EUROSUD students across partners.
III. Qualitative: Student Centred Teaching & Learning		III.1. Transparency of the learning outcomes	The joint programme is described in ECTS.
	A joint Diploma Supplement is issued to the student at the end of the joint study programme intended learning outcomes.		YES: a joint diploma supplement is issued on behalf of the joint degree EUROSUD partners by the coordinator (UoG), while the double degree partner (AMU) also produces an individual diploma supplement.
			YES: the consortium agreed ILOs (intended learning outcomes) are listed on the EUROSUD website, programme handbook and form part of the approval documentation of the respective partners.
	III.2. Quality assurance arrangements	Internal and external QA is conducted in accordance with the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG). The programme, the study field or the institutions are accredited/evaluated by an EQAR-registered agency. If external quality assurance is required at programme level in the countries involved, the transnational programme should be accredited/evaluated preferably using the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (EA).	YES: all EUROSUD partners have internal QA procedures and the majority of EUROSUD partner countries are recognised externally by the EQAR for at least institutional QA purposes. Some are also recognised for programme specific purposes. Please note: accreditation through the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (EA) is being considered by the EUROSUD consortium for action during the next 3 to 4 years.
III.3. Flexible and embedded student mobility arrangements	The joint programme includes at least 1 period of student physical mobility at another partner institution of at least 30 ECTS. The joint programme includes a total of at least 6 months of physical mobility at another partner institution (including secondment). If applicable, in addition to physical mobility, the joint programme includes opportunities for doctoral candidates to participate in one or more of these activities at another partner institution: teaching activities, international events,	YES: EUROSUD students spend at least 30 ECTS each with three different mobility partners over a 2yr period NOTE: EUROSUD is a master level programme (doctoral criteria is not applicable).	

Cluster	Criterion	Indicators	EUROSUD
		international conferences, joint research scientific projects between partner institutions, joint research publications with researchers from partner institutions.	
	III.4. Innovative learning approaches	The joint programme includes embedded interdisciplinary and/or transdisciplinary and/or inter-sectoral components using student-centred and/or challenged-based approaches.	YES: EUROSUD is delivered by a combination of faculties, facilitating interdisciplinarity: Politics, IR, Sociology, History, Law, Economics, Humanities. Courses on Research Design and Methodology are also offered from an inter-disciplinary perspective.
			YES: EUROSUD adopts a student-centred approach to learning throughout students are offered maximum curriculum choice according to their interests and strengths. They can select from among 8 different Study Track combinations; within most Study Tracks they may also choose from among a variety of optional courses; within many courses, particularly the overview courses in S1, students have the capacity to select topics and themes, work in groups, develop critical capacities and receive tailored feedback. Furthermore, EUROSUD students come from different disciplinary backgrounds and have different learning needs in this respect. Staff expertise from across CPUs is drawn to accommodate these needs particularly regarding methods training and at the Dissertation stage.
	III.5. Alternative learning formats (optional)	In addition to physical mobility, the joint programme includes additional formats of transnational learning activities with partner higher education institutions (e.g., online or blended, in the format of regular or intensive courses, summer/winter schools).	YES: EUROSUD has blended learning opportunities: Some classes use reverse classroom design, combining online and offline elements; some of the Masterclasses and seminars held across CPUs and in the Lisbon winter school are hybrid and open to all EUROSUD students; an annual course on Methodological Techniques for Data Collection is offered online; Dissertation Colloquia for fourth semester students and vivas are held online.
III. 6. Digital skills (optional)	The joint programme includes components and actions related to the development of high-level digital skills of students, it offers high quality digital education content, as well as assessment of student skills.	YES: EUROSUD graduates are expected to be fully competent users of digital technology through their active participation in online modules (ICS-ULisboa), training in producing digital content (UAM) use of digital learning platforms (all partners), and profound understanding of ethics in the digital domain (as part of Dissertation training) by the end of their time in the programme.	
IV. European Values: Inclusion & Sustainability	IV.1. Multilingualism	During the joint programme, each student is exposed to at least 2 different EU official languages, language classes excluded.	YES: EUROSUD students are immersed in at least three different languages and cultures during the 2yr programme, where they live in three different countries (two, if one of those languages/countries is their home language/ country).
		Exposure to EU official languages can take place in active and/or passive use of language(s), at any level in teaching and/or learning activities, examinations,	YES: although EUROSUD is primarily delivered and assessed in English some of the partners offer courses in other languages, which students can attend, if they have the minimum required

Cluster	Criterion	Indicators	EUROSUD
		research activities, professional or civic engagement activities and during mobility periods, including by going on mobility to a country where a different EU official language is predominantly used in daily life.	language level: UAM offers optional courses in Spanish in Semester 2 (students are assessed in Spanish or English). AMU offers all courses in French and assessment is in French. The Dissertation is written and assessed in English in all Year 2 CPUs (NKUA, UAM, AMU, LUISS).
	IV.2. Inclusiveness and sustainability	The joint programme commits to wide participation through socially and geographically inclusive admission through tailored measures for all categories of disadvantaged students.	YES: all partners have policies for enabling students with disabilities/ individual needs to access the programme. YES: the EUROSUD programme has had ERASMUS MUNDUS funding in the past which enables it to promote scholarships in less advantaged regions of the world.
		The joint programme commits to respect the principles of the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers and commits to the principles of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA) Green Charter.	YES: EUROSUD is not in receipt of MSCA funding, but it does adhere to the principles of the Green Charter: For instance, UoG and other CPUs have adopted renewables and sustainability strategies. As a programme EUROSUD adheres to a no paper policy and all Dissertations are submitted, disseminated, and marked in electronic form. EUROSUD recommends low-emissions means of transport to access in-person meetings (i.e. train) and mostly use teleconferencing for CMBs, Exam Boards and Student-Staff Meetings.
	IV. 3. Language classes (optional)	The joint programme offers the possibility to take language classes to enhance the command of multiple European languages.	YES: students have the option to attend other 2nd language courses throughout their programme. This may include EU languages (in preparation for a following mobility period) or it may be for a third country/ world language such as Turkish or Arabic.
	IV. 4. Environmental care (optional)	The joint programme includes components and actions related to environmental sustainability and implements measures to minimise the environmental footprint of its activities.	YES: Courses on climate change and sustainability are offered in the EUROSUD curriculum in theory, law, and policymaking, particularly in the Mediterranean context. An annual Summer School on Climate Change, Migration, and the Rule of Law in the Mediterranean for 1st year EUROSUD students (Istanbul) is planned to begin in the 2024-2025 AY. See above for environmental footprint.
	IV.5. Democratic values (optional)	The joint programme offers the possibility for students to participate in activities promoting democratic values and addressing societal needs of the local community (ies), including volunteering, and to receive ECTS for it.	YES: EUROSUD students commonly take up internships, which may be credit bearing, depending on their study track. Quite often these internships take place in international organisations that promote democracy, human rights and the rule of law, or non-profits, embedded in local communities or serving communities of vulnerable groups such as asylum seekers or children. Students do engage in volunteering, but it is not ECTS accredited.

3.1.2. Interviews with EUROSUD team-members

For brevity and of maintaining anonymity, the data from interviews was summarized and categorized as follows⁶:

1. Role and involvement in various programs:

Responsibilities of overseeing administrative implementation and collaboration with various stakeholders.

Involvement in setting up and developing programs, with a focus on administration and delivery.

2. Understanding and views on the European Degree Label:

Familiarity with the criteria and rationale behind the European Degree Label.

Positive perception as a quality assurance framework and a mechanism for encouraging collaborative higher education.

Discussion on the label's comparison with Erasmus Mundus criteria and its relevance to multicultural education.

3. Program-specific challenges and future plans:

Challenges related to accreditation, visa requirements, and distinct regulations across institutions.

Future plans involving balancing employability with research skills in master's programs.

4. Value and benefits of the European Degree Label:

Recognition of the label's importance in quality assurance, student attraction, and program appeal.

Benefits for students, employers, and institutions, including enhancing mobility and cultural sensitivity.

Discussion on the label's role in ensuring employability skills and encouraging joint degree programs.

5. Challenges and implementation questions:

Concerns about the clarity, differentiation of quality levels, and the practical implementation of the label.

Challenges derived from different institutional regulations and the need for common standards.

⁶ If needed, interview transcripts can also be provided.

Questions regarding label's implementation, rollout, and its impact on various stakeholders.

6. Suggestions for improvement and alignment:

Need for clarification on the label's purpose and suggestions for enhancing EUROSUD's alignment with it.

Recommendations for improvements in criteria, including virtual campus aspects and research components.

Proposals for distinct options for professional internships and research routes in programs.

7. Funding, promotion, and launch strategies:

Importance of funding and financial models to sustain the label.

Strategies for a well-managed launch, promotion, and potential worldwide recognition.

Encouragement to extend the label beyond the European Union for inclusiveness.

8. Miscellaneous observations:

Discussion on multiculturalism benefits, particularly in Erasmus Mundus programs.

Evaluation concerns of the European Degree Label and the importance of considering qualitative aspects.

Final remarks appreciating the opportunity to share insights and anticipating future progress.

3.1.3. Focus-groups with students and alumni of EUROSUD

At this point, there is no available data from students and alumni of EUROSUD. The project calendar dedicated to these specific sessions overlapped first with the summer holiday and then with the dissertation defence of the current generation of students. Even though there were some responses from students, no common decision was reached for a time and date for the focus-group. The option of carrying out individual interviews was also explored, with very low response rates. The project team intends to reinstate this process and carry out at least one focus-group with EUROSUD alumni by mid-February to be able to include the data in the final report.

3.1.4. Programme selection questionnaire

These are two sets of answers provided to the programme selection questionnaire by two representatives of EUROSUD, from two different countries. These specific answers were included to reflect the difference in perception and evaluation of criteria based either on different practices in different partner countries, on different perceptions of the programme, or on a different understanding of the criteria and their corresponding indicators.

Item	Respondent 1	Respondent 2
Does the program include an agreement OR partnership with European countries outside the CIVIS Partners?	Yes	Yes

Item	Respondent 1	Respondent 2
Involvement of at least 2 higher education institutions from at least 2 different EU Member states OR from at least 2 different states, one from the EU?	Yes	Yes
The joint programme has an integrated curriculum?	Yes	Yes
The joint programme leads to the award of a joint degree OR multiple degrees?	Yes	Yes
Evaluation of learning outcomes is done by representatives from at least 2 different institutions situated in 2 different countries?	Yes	Yes
Indicate the Joint policies for the joint programme: [The involved HEIs have a joint policy for admission]	Yes	Yes
Indicate the Joint policies for the joint programme: [The involved HEIs have a joint policy for selection]	Yes	Yes
Indicate the Joint policies for the joint programme: [The involved HEIs have a joint policy for supervision]	Yes	Yes
Indicate the Joint policies for the joint programme: [The involved HEIs have a joint policy for monitoring]	Yes	No
Indicate the Joint policies for the joint programme: [The involved HEIs have a joint policy for assessment]	Yes	No
Indicate the Joint policies for the joint programme: [The involved HEIs have a joint recognition procedure]	Yes	Yes
There is no specific admission requirement depending on students' location.	Yes	No
Students have free and easy access to: [IT services]	Yes	Yes
Students have free and easy access to: [Shared infrastructure]	Yes	Yes
Students have free and easy access to: [Library services]	Yes	Yes
Students have free and easy access to: [Development and support offered by the faculty]	Yes	Yes
Students have free and easy access to: [Academic guidance and psychological counselling]	Yes	Yes
Students have free and easy access to: [Career advice/mentoring]	Yes	Yes
Students have free and easy access to: [Alumni systems]	Yes	No
The HEIs involved conducting joint... [Promotion activities to ensure visibility]	Yes	No
The HEIs involved conducting joint... [Awareness activities to ensure visibility]	Yes	No
The HEIs involved conducting joint... [Activities to provide necessary information to students]	Yes	Yes
The HEIs involved conducting joint... [Activities to provide necessary information to other relevant stakeholders (eg. Employers)]	Yes	No
The Joint Programme: [Has a system to monitor graduate outcomes, either at the level of the programme or at the institutional level(s).]	Yes	Yes
The Joint Programme: [Supports future labour market needs and/or includes cooperation with businesses and sectors in its curriculum.]	Yes	No
The Joint Programme: [Provides opportunities for international professional internships/work-based learning recognised through the award of ECTS.]	Yes	Yes
The Joint Programme: [A career development plan devised with the candidate and/or exposure to the non-academic sector (such as internships, seminars, networking)]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme is described in ECTS?	Yes	Yes
The joint programme issues a Joint Diploma Supplement?	Yes	No
Types of quality assurance arrangements	Accredited programme	Accredited programme
The joint programme includes... [At least 1 period of student physical mobility at another partner institution of at least 30 ECTS]	Yes	Yes

Item	Respondent 1	Respondent 2
The joint programme includes... [A total of at least 6 months of physical mobility at another partner institution (including secondment).]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme includes... [Embedded interdisciplinary and/or transdisciplinary student-centered and/or challenged-based approaches.]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme includes... [Embedded inter-sectoral components using student-centered and/or challenged-based approaches.]	Yes	No
The joint programme includes... [Additional formats of transnational learning activities with partner higher education institutions (e.g., online or blended, in the format of regular or intensive courses, summer/winter schools).]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme includes... [Components and actions related to the development of high-level digital skills of students,]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme includes... [Opportunities for doctoral candidates to participate in one or more of these activities at another partner institution: teaching activities, international events, international conferences, joint research scientific projects between partner institutions, joint research publications with researchers from partner institutions.]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme offers: [High quality digital education content]	Yes	No
The joint programme offers: [Assessment of student (digital) skills]	Yes	No
Exposure to EU official languages in active and/or passive use of language(s), at any level in teaching and/or learning activities, examinations, research activities, professional or civic engagement activities and during mobility periods, including by going on mobility to a country where a different EU official language is predominantly used in daily life.	Yes	Yes
The joint programme commits to: [Wide participation through socially and geographically inclusive admission through tailored measures for all categories of disadvantaged students?]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme commits to: [Respect the principles of the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers and commits to the principles of the MSCA Green Charter.]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme offers the possibility to take language classes to enhance the command of multiple European language?	Yes	Yes
The joint programme includes components and actions related to environmental sustainability?	Yes	No
The joint programme implements measures to minimise the environmental footprint of its activities?	Yes	No
The joint programme offers: [The possibility for students to participate in activities promoting democratic values and addressing societal needs of the local community (ies).]	Yes	Yes
The joint programme offers: [The option for students to receive ECTS for these activities (volunteering, involvement in the local community, etc.).]	Yes	No
The joint programme includes volunteering opportunities?	Yes	No

3.1.5. The SMARTT survey (pre-test)

This excerpt from the SMARTT survey answer was part of the pre-test process, together with other iterations meant to provide feedback for the survey in terms of structure, sections, content, question formulation, relevance etc.

Item	Reply on a 1-5 scale OR open answer
Name: Name of the program	International Master in South European Studies (EUROSUD)

Item	Reply on a 1-5 scale OR open answer
Name: Coordinating partner	University of Glasgow
Clarity and Understanding: The EDL criteria are clearly presented in the context of our program.	5
Clarity and Understanding: It is easy to understand the EDL criteria as they apply to our program.	5
Clarity and Understanding: The EDL criteria accurately convey their intended meanings and outcomes in our program's context.	5
Relevance and Alignment I: The EDL criteria align well with our program's outcomes and goals.	5
Relevance and Alignment I: The EDL is relevant in the context of our program.	5
Relevance and Alignment I: The EDL criteria are applicable across different cultural and educational contexts, reflecting its international applicability.	5
Specificity and Detail: The EDL criteria provide detailed guidance specific to our program.	5
Specificity and Detail: The EDL criteria comprehensively reflect the quality and standards of our program.	5
Relevance and Alignment II: Which criteria are most relevant in the context of your program?	flexible and embedded student mobility, inclusiveness and sustainability, transparency of the learning outcomes
Relevance and Alignment II: Which criteria are least relevant in the context of your program?	digital skills
Relevance and Alignment II: Are there obstacles in EDL's global/European applicability in the context of your program?	no
Need for Adaptation: Are there elements within the EDL (criteria, clusters, indicators) that require reformulation for your program?	an upgrading of research skills
Need for Adaptation: Do you perceive any conflict between the criteria and existing quality assurance frameworks or standards in your program?	no
Measurability and Distinctions: The EDL criteria are measurable within our program's context.	4
Measurability and Distinctions: There should be clear distinctions between higher and lower levels of attainment in relation to the EDL criteria.	4
Flexibility and Future Readiness: The EDL criteria are flexible in adapting to future changes in education, technology, and societal needs.	5
Flexibility and Future Readiness: Implementing the EDL is feasible in the context of our program.	5
Consistency with Broader Goals and Values: The criteria are consistent with broader goals at various levels (institutional, accreditation body, national, European, etc.).	5
Consistency with Broader Goals and Values: The EDL criteria align well with the expectations of different stakeholders (students, employers, etc.).	5
Consistency with Broader Goals and Values: The criteria are consistent with the values of fairness, transparency, and integrity in the context of our program.	5
Consistency with Broader Goals and Values: The criteria will significantly contribute to enhancing the reputation and value of our program.	5
Impact Assessment: Identify the main resources in implementing the EDL within your program.	

Item	Reply on a 1-5 scale OR open answer
Impact Assessment: What are the key strengths of the EDL as they pertain to your program?	
Impact Assessment: Provide your recommendations for enhancing the EDL.	
Attitudes: The EDL is valuable in promoting and recognizing high-quality joint/multiple degree programs.	5
Attitudes: Adopting the EDL will significantly contribute to the educational excellence of our program.	5
Attitudes: It is important for our program to align with the EDL criteria.	5
Attitudes: Aligning our program with the EDL criteria fits well with our long-term educational goals.	5
Attitudes: Obtaining the EDL would be a competitive advantage for our program.	5
Attitudes: Obtaining the EDL will significantly benefit our program.	5
Norms: Our stakeholders (faculty, students, alumni) encourage the alignment with the EDL.	
Norms: There is a general expectation from the wider educational community that programs like ours should align with the EDL.	
Norms: Our program team collectively believes that aligning with the EDL is important.	5
Norms: Our program team would recommend other relevant programs to pursue the EDL.	5
Norms: The decision of other similar programs to pursue the EDL influences our decision to do the same.	4
Norms: Most similar programs perceive the EDL positively and see it as beneficial.	
Control: As a program team, we are familiar with the EDL framework and its descriptors.	5
Control: Implementing the criteria required for the EDL in our program would be manageable.	5
Control: We are confident in our ability to meet the requirements for obtaining the EDL.	5
Control: We perceive the process of obtaining the EDL for our program as challenging.	3
Control: We have sufficient resources to successfully align our program with the EDL.	4
Control: We have access to adequate guidance and support for the EDL application process.	2
Control: Our program team is capable of overcoming challenges that may arise in the process of aligning with the EDL.	4
Control: Our program team feels motivated and committed to ensuring our program obtains the EDL.	5
Control: The requirements of the EDL align well with our current program practices and policies.	5
IOU: Our program is planning to apply for the EDL when available.	5
IOU: We are committed to integrating and upholding the EDL criteria in our program, irrespective of the formal pursuit of the label.	5
IOU: Regardless of the current status, our program intends to align with the EDL criteria in the future.	5
IOU: Obtaining or aligning with the EDL will be a priority in our program's strategic planning.	5
IOU: Our program actively advocates for and recommends the adoption of the EDL to other similar programs.	4

Item	Reply on a 1-5 scale OR open answer
Best practices: [01]	These comments have already been provided in an interview with the member of the SMART team.
Feedback: [01]	These comments have already been provided in an interview with the member of the SMART team.