



Deliverable 6

Dataset

February 2024





Screening, mapping, analyzing, recommending, transferring and transforming HE international programmes

Project number	
Delivery date	29 February 2024
Document title	Dataset
Lead beneficiary	
WP number	WP3
No. of pages	38 (and 4 Annexes)
Author	
Contributors	

February 2024

Legal Disclaimer

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.



About SMARTT

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 programs 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 6) is part of Work Package 3 and it reflects the methodology, instruments and the dataset, including quantitative and qualitative data gathered in the second part of the project implementation (November 2023 – February 2024). The data presented in this report reflects the second phase of the project, aimed at validating the European Degree Label against at least 50 programmes from CIVIS and its partner alliances. The document presents all relevant data and information for developing recommendations and proposals, as collected from focus groups, interviews, questionnaires.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



SMARTT

Dataset

Table of Contents

1. Overview	6
1.1. Specific objectives of the SMARTT project	6
1.2. Specific objectives of WP3	6
2. Methodological approach	8
2.1. Introduction.....	8
2.2. Methodology and instruments	8
2.2.1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group	8
2.2.2. Interviews and focus-groups with relevant stakeholders	9
2.2.3. Programme selection questionnaire	12
2.2.4. The SMARTT survey	21
3. Dataset	28
3.1 Selection Questionnaire.....	28
3.2 Interviews/focus-groups with relevant stakeholders.....	34
3.1. The SMARTT survey	35
3. Annexes	38
3.2. Annex 1. SMARTT Selection questionnaire raw data	38
3.3. Annex 2. SMARTT Selection questionnaire data scores	38
3.4. Annex 3. SMARTT Survey database	38
3.5. Annex 4. SMARTT. Focus group summary	38

1. Overview

For the purpose of this Deliverable, the report will comprise a general presentation of the specific objectives of the SMARTT project and of the WP3, a general approach and methodological framework used to analyse the 50 programmes in the second stage of the project, as well as a general presentation of the instruments used in collecting the data. The in-depth analysis of this first phase in the SMARTT project will be presented in Deliverable 13 (CIVIS Report on quantitative and qualitative analysis).

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
- Organising a large **dissemination** event and elaborating **materials**.

1.2. Specific objectives of WP3

WP3 was built on WP2 as it replicated some of the instruments and processes developed in WP2 and piloted on EUROSUD on 50+ programmes in CIVIS and its' partner alliances.

1. Test the European Degree Label criteria on extended list of programmes and educational activities developed by CIVIS Alliance member universities.
2. Replicate the screening and testing process on a larger scale, covering multiple regional and local contexts, fields of studies, types of programmes.
3. Extend coverage of recommendations and proposals for a European approach on European Degrees to wider geographical and educational landscape.

2

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

Methodology and Instruments

2. Methodological approach

2.1. Introduction

The second stage of the SMARTT project (November 2023 – February 2024) entailed expanding the focus from the pilot carried out on EUROSUD to more than 50 programmes part of CIVIS and its partner alliances.

The process included the following steps:

1. **Selection:** We developed a selection questionnaire based on the EDL criteria and indicators, which would help us better map the CIVIS and its' partner university alliances' programmes against the EDL. The aim was to do an initial validation of the EDL against existing programmes, map the programmes based on the EDL criteria and select the most relevant programmes to be further analysed within the project.
2. **Exploration:** To ensure representation in the process of several relevant voices, we included a stage of exploration, which refers to carrying out a number of focus-groups and interviews with relevant stakeholders at the European level, representing either public policymakers, such as Ministries of Education, or National Quality Assurance Agencies, and student representatives among others.
3. **Clarification:** Based on the first two stages, we created and disseminated a survey analysing more in-depth the perspective of CIVIS' and its' partner alliances' programmes with regards to the EDL.

2.2. Methodology and instruments

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

1. Workshops with the Core Experts Group and the Enlarged Experts Group
2. A programme selection questionnaire.
3. Interviews and focus-groups with relevant stakeholders.
4. The SMARTT survey

The following section comprises the detailed presentation of the processes and instruments used during this second 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:

- 01.** Develop a **SMARTT vision** for the European Label **criteria**.
- 02.** Develop a **SMARTT proposal** for the **revised European label criteria**.
- 03.** Propose **methods for applying** the **SMARTT evaluation indicators**.
- 04.** **Identify, define, and describe** the corresponding **SMARTT evaluation indicators**.

The workshops and working groups' sessions developed during the first stage of the project were also carried out throughout the second stage, continuing the in-person (when possible) and online sessions. The in-person session carried out in September 2023, in Bucharest, represented one main

event allowing us to better understand the Core and Enlarged Experts' Groups' perspectives on the EDL, also helping us to better define the SMARTT Survey. Throughout the second stage of the project, there was further development of the shared working area on Google Drive for efficient collaboration and communication among all project participants, as we continued incorporating feedback from the expanded group of experts. Several drafts of the EDL criteria and indicators were created and continuously revised based on feedback and experts' feedback and input. Similarly to the first stage of the project (piloting), 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 and focus-groups with relevant stakeholders

Interviews and focus-groups with relevant stakeholders were planned and were carried out along with formal conversations throughout this second stage of the process. A detailed description of the interviews/focus-groups is presented below.

General description of the interviews:

The interviews and focus-groups with relevant stakeholders entailed individual/small-group conversations, depending on availability, with representatives from National Ministries of Education and Quality Assurance Agencies throughout Europe. The aim of these sessions was to **gather insights and perspectives from the individuals who are/will be involved in processes related to EDL following its implementation**. These interviews provide an opportunity to explore the alignment of the criteria outlined in the European Degree Label with national and European existing frameworks and practices.

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 session aimed to explore the European approach to quality assurance, laying the groundwork for constructive dialogue on the development and integration of the EDL to ensure its relevance and benefits for educational agencies and institutions. Participants' insights were sought to shape the EDL framework effectively. The meeting lasting about an hour, was recorded for reference, ensuring confidentiality and anonymity, highlighting the value of participants' contributions to the EDL's ongoing development.

Interview/focus-group objectives:

1. To collect insights and expertise from educational agencies and institutions on the concept and potential implementation of the EDL, ensuring it aligns with existing educational structures and quality assurance practices.
2. To understand how stakeholders perceive the EDL as an optional enhancement to the educational landscape, including its potential benefits and challenges.

3. To explore opportunities for integrating the EDL with current national accreditations and educational structures, aiming to enrich and perhaps elevate the quality and recognition of education within the European context.
4. To assess the relevance, feasibility, and practicality of the EDL from the perspectives of various educational agencies and institutions, identifying key considerations for its development and implementation.
5. To facilitate a constructive dialogue among stakeholders, fostering a collaborative environment where ideas and concerns can be shared openly, laying a foundational context for the EDL's conceptualization.
6. To use the insights gathered from these discussions to thoughtfully and pragmatically construct the EDL framework, ensuring it meets the needs and expectations of the broader educational community.
7. To ensure that the development and integration processes of the EDL are carried out effectively, benefiting all stakeholders involved and enhancing the quality assurance mechanisms across Europe.
8. To build consensus among key stakeholders and garner support for the EDL, addressing any reservations and highlighting the potential value addition of the EDL to European higher education.

Structure of the sessions:

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.
- 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.

2. Role of interviewee:

- a. Gathering information about the interviewee's background, their role, and their areas of expertise.

3. Program Overview:

- a. Exploring the processes involved in joint degree programmes, including coordination among partner institutions, administrative procedures, and decision-making mechanisms etc.

4. European Degree Label Criteria:

- a. Exploring the interviewee's understanding and interpretation of the European Degree Label criteria.

5. Alignment validation:

- a. Validating the degree to which the European Label Criteria currently aligns with existing joint degree programmes, examining the different clusters and criteria in detail.

6. Strengths and challenges:

- a. Identifying the strengths and areas of alignment between the European Degree Label criteria and existing joint degree programmes, as well as any challenges or gaps that may exist.

7. Enhancing alignment:

- a. Discussing strategies and recommendations to further enhance the alignment of existing joint degree programmes 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 future of joint degree programmes and their alignment with the European Degree Label.
- c. Provide any additional information regarding the next steps in incorporating the European Degree Label criteria into existing programmes and how the interviewee can stay informed about its progress.

Introduction:

Thank you for participating in this focus group discussion/interview.

This focus group session is convened to explore the concept of the European Degree Label (EDL) as an optional and potential enhancement in our educational landscape. As we acknowledge the robust structures and national accreditations currently in place, our intention is not to propose changes to these well-established systems, but rather to consider the EDL as an opportunity that could align with - and perhaps enrich them.

Our discussion today is grounded in the understanding that some agencies are already employing the European approach to quality assurance. While we might not delve into the specific differences and commonalities between this approach and the EDL, we hope to lay a foundational context for a constructive dialogue.

The primary objective of this meeting is to ensure that the development and integration of the EDL work effectively for your agencies/institutions. Your insights and expertise are invaluable in shaping the EDL in a manner that is relevant and beneficial for your agencies and institutions and the broader educational community.

As we proceed, your perspectives will be instrumental in helping us construct the EDL framework thoughtfully and pragmatically. We look forward to a productive discussion.

The discussion will last approximately **1 hour**, and your input will greatly contribute to the ongoing development of the European Degree Label.

With your permission, the session will be recorded for reference, audio transcription, and analysis purposes only. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained.

Thank you for your participation and valuable contributions!

Questions

1. Could you please provide your general opinion/perspective on the European Degree Label?
 - a. Could you please provide your vision on how (if) the EDL could contribute to the quality and recognition of joint degree programs?
2. Given the general information available on the EDL, which would you say are the most relevant criteria?
 - a. In your opinion, is there any relevant criterion missing/ any criterion you would recommend being added?
3. From your perspective, what would be a **compelling argument in favour** of the European Degree Label? (*What would make the EDL more `appealing` for you/other stakeholders?*)
 - a. Can you pinpoint any distinct **benefits** that the European Degree Label might introduce?
4. What **potential challenges** do you anticipate in the label's implementation?
 - a. How might they be **overcome**?

5. Are there specific **reservations your organisation holds** regarding the label's implementation?
 - a. How could the label be positioned to **be more compelling** for stakeholders like yours?
 - b. How can the label be **adapted to resonate more with the expectations** of the wider educational community?
6. Which **legal aspects** (at institutional, national, or European levels) need to be factored in for the label's smooth implementation?
7. Are there any global or European quality assurance **initiatives/examples/best-practices** that could inform the European Degree Label's development?
8. Who do you think is best positioned to **award** the European Degree Label?
 - a. What might be an appropriate **frequency for renewing the label**?
9. What key factors should be **prioritized when planning the label's deployment**?
10. How can discussions about the European Degree Label be more **consensus-driven**?
11. Is there any **other feedback** or insight you'd like to share regarding the European Degree Label?

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. 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	Humanities	Social Science	STEM	Health
Fashion, interior and industrial design	Religion and theology	Economics	Biology	Dental Studies
Fine Arts	History and Archaeology	Political Science and Civics	Biochemistry	Medicine
Handcrafts	Philosophy and ethics	Psychology	Environmental science	Nursing and midwifery
Music and Performing Art	Language acquisition	Sociology and cultural studies	Chemistry	Medical diagnostic and treatment technology
	Literature and linguistics	Journalism and reporting	Earth Sciences	Pharmacy
	Education Science	Library, information, and archival studies	Physics	
	Finance, banking and insurance		Mathematics	
	Marketing and advertising		Statistics	
	Management and administration		Computer Use	
	Law		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	

- The programme selection criteria are **based on**:
 - the European Degree Label (EDL) criteria (*Par. 2.1.1*)
 - general standards for joint programmes¹
 - general-structural principles.

- 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** (*Par. 2.1*);
 - b. **Internal selection procedure** (*Par. 2.2*);
 - c. **Results** (*Par. 2.3*)
 - **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 programs of the partner universities, out of which 50 programs 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 (see Par. 2.1.1);
 - b. construction of the **scoring system** according to each of the **EDL Criteria** (see Par. 2.1.1);
 - c. **Monitoring** system of the pre-selection procedure (see Par. 2.2).
 - Directly **involve partner universities** in order 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 (see Par. 2.2);
 - 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 is being tested, not the programmes.

¹ Based on <https://impea.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Joint-Programmes-from-A-to-Z-Report-2020.pdf>



2.1 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, Par. 2.1.2*):
 - 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, Par. 2.1.2*).
 - 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.

2.1.1. List of criteria and proposed scores

No.	COMPULSORY CRITERIA	Score	OPTIONAL CRITERIA	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
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		

2.1.2. 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	
		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
	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

II. Functional: Labour Market & Employability	i. Visibility & awareness (optional)	Students have free and easy access to alumni systems	Yes/No	0,78
		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
	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 arrangements	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 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/No	2,33
IV. European Values: Inclusion & Sustainability	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, The joint programme offers assessment of student (digital) skills.	Yes/No	1
		The joint programme offers assessment of student (digital) skills.	Yes/No	1
	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	Yes/No	3,5

	categories of disadvantaged students	Yes/No	
	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
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			100

2.2 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 (see Par. 2.1);**
 - the responses sent will automatically be entered into an **Excel matrix**.

- During such 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 e 15 September 2023.

2.3 Results

- SUR, once the **data collection phase** has been **completed** (see *Par. 2.2*):
 - 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

- Its aim was 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 - par. 2.1.1*) 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), in order 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).

2.2.4. The SMARTT survey

The WP2 and WP3 leaders developed the general approach for the SMARTT survey, as well as the draft in order to allow for pre-testing on EUROSUD. The SMARTT survey was initially carried out in

a pre-testing phase on EUROSUD, in order to allow for the revision of the final version of the survey, that was later disseminated throughout the 50+ CIVIS and partner programmes.

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.
 - o 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 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.

In order 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)². 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 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 Utilisation Intention (UI).

The survey is distributed electronically using SoSci Survey³, 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 in order 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.

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]*

² 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)

³ <https://www.soscisurvey.de/>



- 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 the 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 current 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

CIVIS Data

3. Dataset

This section will present the existing data collected through the instruments previously described. In the case of qualitative data, in order 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. The data will be presented following the structure of the previous chapter. The in-depth analysis and outputs are further detailed in Deliverable 13.

3.1 Selection Questionnaire

The selection questionnaire was filled in by representatives of the following universities and programmes:

<i>University:</i>	<i>Title of the Programme</i>	<i>Type of programme:</i>	<i>If yes, which country do you work with?</i>	COUNTA din Title of the Programme
Aix-Marseille Université	DPI Master of Economics	Double Degree Programme		1
	Europhotonics	Joint Degree Programme	"Germany""Spain""Finland""Lithuania"	1
	Fusion EP	Joint Degree Programme	"Germany", "Belgium", "France", "Czechia"	1
	International Double-Degree FunPhys Master / Laurea di Fisica: a "Diplome en Partenariat International" (DPI) between AMU and Genoa University (Italy) Application on e-candidat "Master 1 (or 2) Physique (Partenariat international) - St-Charles"	Double Degree Programme	Italy	1
	Nanotechnologies : Chemical nano-engineering (CNE)	Joint Degree Programme	"Poland" "Italy"	1
	WAVES (Waves, Acoustic, Vibrations, Engineering & Sounds)	Joint Degree Programme	"Portugal", "Spain"	1
Total for Aix-Marseille Université				6
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens	International Master in South European Studies	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Portugal	1
	"Master in Palaeobiology, Geoconservation and Applied Palaeontology" (PANGEA)	Joint Degree Programme	"Portugal", "Sweden", "France"	1
	European Master's Programme on Society, Science and Technology	Multiple Degree Programme	France, Belgium, The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Estonia, Spain, Portugal	1

	School Counseling and Guidance	Joint Degree Programme	Cyprus	1
	South European Studies (EUROSUD)/Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree 2018	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Italy, Portugal	1
Total for National and Kapodistrian University of Athens				5
Neurotech-European University of brain and technology	Erasmus Mundus Master Programme in Public Health in Distasters	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Spain, Cyprus	1
	Erasmus Mundus Master's in Translational Cosmetic and Dermatological Sciences	Joint Degree Programme	Italy, Belgium	1
	MATER Innovative Training Network in Female Reproductive Care	Double Degree Programme	Finland, Estonia, Belgium	1
Total for Neurotech-European University of brain and technology				3
Paris Lodron Universität Salzburg	Copernicus Master in Digital Earth (Erasmus Mundus 2018-2024; 2023-2029)	Joint Degree Programme	Brazil, Norway	1
	MA & MSc in Digital Communication Leadership	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Denmark, Belgium, Netherlands	1
	PoSIG - Political Science, Integration, and Governance	Joint Degree Programme	Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Italy, Kosovo, Montenegro, North Macedonia,	1
Total for Paris Lodron Universität Salzburg				3
Sapienza Università di Roma	Archaeological Materials Science (ARCHMAT)	Joint Degree Programme	Portugal, Greece	1
	CdL Magistrale in Architettura e Studies in Architecture (Single-Cycle-5-Year Studies in Architecture)	Double Degree Programme		1
	Cooperazione internazionale e sviluppo	Double Degree Programme	Albania	1
	DD "Financial institutions, international finance and risk management" (SAP) AND "Finance curriculum Financial	Double Degree Programme		1

	Risk Management" (AIX-MARSEILLE)			
	DD "Financial institutions, international finance and risk management" (SAP) and "Sciences de Gestion à finalité spécialisée en Banking & Asset Management" (HEC-ULg)	Double Degree Programme	Belgium	1
	Double degree	Double Degree Programme	France (Sorbonne)	1
	Double degree Master - Sapienza Università di Roma/Universität Bielefeld	Double Degree Programme		1
	Double Degree of Sapienza Master Degree in Electronics Engineering and Master of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering of the Georgia Institute of Technology	Double Degree Programme	USA	1
	Double Master degree in microbiology	Double Degree Programme		1
	ECCA (Etiche Contemporanee e Concezioni Antiche - Éthiques Contemporaines et Conceptions Antiques)	Double Degree Programme		1
	Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree in Sustainable Transportation and Electrical Power Systems	Joint Degree Programme		1
	Erasmus Mundus Lascala Master "Large Scale	Multiple Degree Programme		1
	EUROPEAN LAW SCHOOL, DOPPIA LAUREA ITALO FRANCESE, UNIVERSITA' AMERICANE	Multiple Degree Programme	LONDRA	1
	Laurea a doppio titolo fra Aix-Marseille Université e Sapienza Università di Roma tra il master in Histoire, Civilisations, Patrimoine (Aix-Marseille) e la Laurea magistrale in Filologia, Letterature e Storia del mondo antico (LM 15) (Sapienza)	Double Degree Programme		1
	Master Philosophy - curriculum German Idealism and european modern philosophy	Double Degree Programme		1

	Programma di Doppio Titolo con la Wuhan University- Laurea Magistrale	Double Degree Programme	China	1
	Statistical Methods and Applications	Double Degree Programme		1
Total for Sapienza Università di Roma				17
Stockholm University	Latin America and Europe in a Global World	Joint Degree Programme	Spain and France (the latter is main partner)	1
Total for Stockholm University				1
UNITA-Universitas Montium	DOBLE MÁSTER EN DIRECCIÓN Y PLANIFICACIÓN DEL TURISMO-GÉOGRAPHIE ET AMÉNAGEMENT, SPÉCIALITÉ PROFESSIONNELLE “LOISIRS, TOURISME ET DÉVELOPPEMENT TERRITORIAL” CON LA UNIVERSITÉ DE PAU ET DES PAYS DE L’ADOUR (UPPA).	Double Degree Programme		1
	Double degree in literature and linguistics Turin-Chambery	Double Degree Programme	Italy, France	1
	Double degree in modern literature Turin-Chambery	Double Degree Programme	Italy, France	1
	Economic POLicies for the Global transition (EPOG+)	Joint Degree Programme	Austria, France, Germany, Italy, South Africa	1
	European and international business law	Multiple Degree Programme	Lithuania (but also Italy with UNITO (Torino)	1
	European Computer Science	Double Degree Programme	Finland, Portugal	1
	Planificarea si Dezvoltarea Durabila a Teritoriului/ Territorial Sustainable Planning and Development	Double Degree Programme	France	1
Total for UNITA-Universitas Montium				7
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid	Chemistry Double Degree Programme UAM-ECPM	Double Degree Programme	France	1
	4Cities Erasmus Mundus Euromaster in Urban Studies	Joint Degree Programme	Belgium	1
	Doble titulación en Ciencia Política UAM / IEP Bordeaux	Multiple Degree Programme		1

	Doble Titulación en Derecho UAM-Universidad de Estrasburgo (UNISTRA)	Double Degree Programme	France	1
	Double Degree in Economics and Business Administration	Double Degree Programme	France	1
	Double Degree in Tourism Management UAM - ANGERS	Double Degree Programme	France	1
	MÁSTER EN ESTUDIOS ARTÍSTICOS, LITERARIOS Y DE LA CULTURA	Multiple Degree Programme		1
	Master Erasmus Mundus in Theoretical Chemistry and Computational Modelling	Joint Degree Programme	The Netherlands, Belgium, Italy and France	1
Total for Universidad Autónoma de Madrid				8
Universität Tübingen	Palaeolithic Archaeology	Multiple Degree Programme		1
Total for Universität Tübingen				1
Université de Lille	European Master in Advanced Solid Mechanics	Joint Degree Programme	Poland, Belgium	1
	European Master in Advanced Spectroscopy in Chemistry (Erasmus Mundus)	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Finland, Poland	1
	European Master in Biorefinery	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Poland	1
	European Master in Medical Technology and Healthcare Business	Joint Degree Programme	Portugal	1
	European Master in Medical Technology and Healthcare Business	Joint Degree Programme	Portugal. (Taiwan may not be relevant for this study)	1
	European Master in Paleontology, Geoconservation and Applications	Mixt (Joint & Multiple) Degree Programme	Portugal	1
Total for Université de Lille				6
Université Libre de Bruxelles	Master en sciences politiques orientation relations internationales à finalité monde	Double Degree Programme	Italy	1
Total for Université				1

Libre de Bruxelles				
University of Bucharest	Istoria și Circulația Ideilor Filosofice / History and Circulation of Philosophical Ideas	Double Degree Programme		1
	Master in International Public Affairs (MIPA)	Double Degree Programme		1
	Master of Business Administration (MBA)	Double Degree Programme		1
	Politique à l'âge global. Etats, frontières et sociétés	Double Degree Programme	Democratic Republic of Congo, among others	1
Total for University of Bucharest				4
University of Glasgow	Adult Education for Social Change	EMJM	UK, Cyprus (Open University), Malta, Estonia (Tallinn)	1
	AI & Digital Society	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Netherlands (Radboud)	1
	Business & Management Studies	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Germany (Leuphana)	1
	Business & Management Studies	undergraduate Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Germany (Leuphana)	1
	Central & East European, Russian & Eurasian Studies	EMJM	UK, Estonia (Tartu), Poland (Jagellonian), Hungary (Corvinus), Georgia (Ilia State), Kazakhstan (KIMEP), Bosnia & Herzegovina (Sarajevo)	1
	Comparative Politics & Communication	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Netherlands (Radboud)	1
	Comparative Politics - Russia, Eastern Europe and Eurasia	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Netherlands (Radboud)	1
	Economic Development & Social Change	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Netherlands (Radboud)	1
	Education in Museums & Heritage	EMJM	UK, Netherlands (Radboud), Estonia (Tartu), Malta	1
	Education Policies for Global Development	EMJM	Spain (UABarcelona), UK, Germany (Bremen), Cyprus	1
	Euro-Asian MBA-MSc	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Indonesia (ITBandung)	1
	Euro-Asian MBA-MSc	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Malaysia (Malaya)	1
	Euro-Asian MBA-MSc	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Malaysia (Sains Malaysia)	1
	Global Markets, Local Creativities	EMJM	UK, Netherlands (EU Rotterdam), Germany (Gottingen), Japan (Kyoto), Spain (Barcelona), Colombia (Los Andes)	1
	Global Political Economy	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Netherlands (Radboud)	1
	International Business & Development Studies	master Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Netherlands (Radboud)	1

	International Economic Law	LLM Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Germany (Leuphana)	1
	International Law of Global Security, Peace & Development	EMJM	UK, Spain (IBEI), Belgium (FU Bruxelles), Estonia (Tallinn), Netherlands (Radboud), Germany (Leuphana)	1
	Law	LLM Dual Degree Programmes	UK & France (Paris 1 Sorbonne)	1
	Law	LLM Dual Degree Programmes	UK & Italy (Trento)	1
	Managing Art & Cultural Heritage in Global Markets	EMJM	UK, Portugal (Lisbon and ISCTE), France (IESA), Netherlands (EU Rotterdam)	1
	Security, Intelligence & Strategic Studies	EMJM	UK, Ireland (DublinCU), Italy (Trento), Czech Republic (Charles, Pargue)	1
	South European Studies	EMJM	UK, Spain (UAMadrid), Greece (NKU Athens), Italy (LUISS), France (Aix-Marseille), Portugal (Lisbon)	1
	South European Studies (EUROSUD)	Joint Degree Programme	I don't know	1
	Tourism Development & Culture	EMJM	UK, Malta, Sweden (Lund), Portugal (ISCTE)	1
Total for University of Glasgow				25
Total				87

The final database for the selection questionnaire is included in Annex 1. For the purpose of anonymity, there is no connection between the position of an individual university in the table above and the data further presented.

The first table represents the raw data gathered from representatives of the above-mentioned universities and programmes, while the second table (Annex 2) reflects the scores associated with each indicator and EDL criterion, as described in the methodology.

3.2 Interviews/focus-groups with relevant stakeholders

For the purpose of brevity and of maintaining anonymity, the data from interviews/focus-groups was summarised (Annex 3).

The full transcripts of the interviews/focus-groups can be made available, as necessary.

The countries and institutions participating in these sessions were:

Country	Organisation
Austria	Agentur Fur Qualitatssicherung und Akkreditieru
Belgium	Academie de Recherche et d'Enseignement Superieur - ARES
France	Ministere de L'Enseignement Superieur et de la Recherche
Germany	Ministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst Baden-Württemberg
Germany	German Accreditation Council
Greece	Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs
Italy	ANVUR
Romania	Agentia Romana de Asigurare a Calitatii in Invatamantul Superior - ARACIS

Spain	Fundacion para el Conocimiento Madrimasd
Spain	ANECA
Spain	Ministerio de Universidades Espanol
Sweden	Swedish Higher Education Authority
Swiss	Staatssekretariat für Bildung, Forschung und Innovation (SERI)
Swiss	Swiss Agency of Accreditation and Quality Assurance (AAQ)
United Kingdom	QAA

3.1. The SMARTT survey

The SMARTT Survey was addressed to 95 programmes (based on the selection questionnaire described above) and it was filled out by 50 programmes (following the pruning and validating the data), as follows.

The database is reflected in Annex 4, which comprises all answers, anonymized. There is no correlation between the data in Annex 4 and the following list of programmes and institutions.

No.	Name of the program	Coordinating university
1	Master of Economics	Aix Marseille University, France
2	IMMIT (International Master in the Management of IT)	Aix Marseille University, France
3	Europhotonics	Aix Marseille University, France
4		Aix Marseille University, France
5	WAVES	Aix Marseille University, France
6	European Computer Science	all partners have the same roles - there is no coordinator
7	MA Double Degree	Ca'Foscari University, Venice, Italy
8	Master Politique à l'âge global. Etats, frontières et sociétés	EHESS Paris, France
9	4Cities Erasmus Mundus Euromaster in Urban Studies	Free University of Brussels - Flemish, Belgium
10	LAGLOBE - Latin America and Europe in a Global World	IHEAL - Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III, France
11	Double Degree in Political Science	LUISS (Roma), Italy
12	Science, Technology, Society -- Science and Technology Studies (STS)	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
13	Language Teachers in Europe: Education in Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Schools	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
14	School Counseling and Guidance	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece
15	Digital Communication Leadership	Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Austria
16	Joint MA Political Science - Integration & Governance (PoSIG)	Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Austria
17	Copernicus Master in Digital Earth	Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Austria
18	Lascala	Paris Saclay, France
19	Erasmus Mundus Master in Theoretical Chemistry and Computational Modelling	Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain
20	Máster en Estudios Artísticos, Literarios y de la Cultura (mention Musicologie parcours Musique et Culture)	Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain
21	Doble Titulación en Ciencia Política UAM- Sciences Po / FIFE	Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain
22	Double Diplôme UAM - UPD PSL	Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain
23		Universita di Sapienza, Italy
24	Culture e letteratura del mondo moderno - Licence; Culture Moderne Comparete - Master	Universita di Torino, Italy

25	Double diplôme Franco-Italien Turin-Chambery (Dip. Lingue e letterature straniere e culture moderne)	Universita di Torino, Italy
26	EMMaH - Euro-Asian Master in Medical Technology and Healthcare Business	Université de Lille, France
27	BIOREF european master	Université de Lille, France
28	Double degree Diplome	Université de Strasbourg, France
29	Doble Titulación en Derecho UAM-UNISTRA	Université de Strasbourg, France
30	EPOG+ - Economic analysis and policy	Université de Technologie de Compiègne, France
31	European master "E.G.A.L.E.S."; local master "Equal Opportunities Policies in Romania and EU"	Université Lumière Lyon 2, France
32	"European & International Business Law" Joint Master degree	Université Savoie Mont Mont Blanc, France
33	MASTER INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS	University of Bucharest, Romania
34	MBA	University of Bucharest, Romania
35	Istoria și Circulația Ideilor Filosofice / History and Circulation of Philosophical Ideas	University of Bucharest, Romania
36	Legal and political science double degree	University of Bucharest, Romania
37	Archeological Materials Science (ARCHMAT)	University of Evora, Portugal
38	double diploma: FunPhys/Laurea di Fisica	University of Genoa, Italy
39	FunPhys Master program	University of Genoa, Italy
40	International Master in South European Studies (EUROSUD)	University of Glasgow, UK
41	MSC development studies	University of Glasgow, UK
42	GLOCAL	University of Glasgow, UK
43	CLMC 2021-2023	University of Glasgow, UK
44	Managing Art & Cultural Heritage in Global Markets	University of Glasgow, UK
45	ILGSPD	University of Glasgow, UK
46	Erasmus Mundus Master Programme in Public Health in Distasters	University of Oviedo, Spain
47	EMJMD in Sustainable Transportation and Electrical Power Systems	University of Oviedo, Spain
48	Palaeolithic Archaeology	University of Tübingen, Germany
49	ALIANZA UNITA (DOBLE MÁSTER EN DIRECCIÓN Y PLANIFICACIÓN DEL TURISMO-GÉOGRAPHIE ET AMÉNAGEMENT, SPÉCIALITÉ PROFESSIONNELLE "LOISIRS, TOURISME ET DÉVELOPPEMENT TERRITORIAL" CON LA UNIVERSITÉ DE PAU ET DES PAYS DE L'ADOUR (UPPA).)	University of Zaragoza, Spain
50	Unita - Universitas Montium - Planificarea si Dezvoltarea Durabila a Teritoriului/ Territorial Sustainable Planning and Development	West University of Timisoara, Romania

4

ANNEXES

3. Annexes

- 3.2. Annex 1. SMARTT Selection questionnaire raw data. [Click here to access the excel.](#)
- 3.3. Annex 2. SMARTT Selection questionnaire data scores. [Click here to access the data.](#)
- 3.4. Annex 3. SMARTT Survey database. [Click here to access the database.](#)
- 3.5. Annex 4 SMARTT. Focus group summary (next page).

EDL awarding	Criteria recommendations	Role QA Agencies	European Approach	Reservations
<p>The European Commission would be the best to award the EDL. The higher you go, the better recognition and projection it has.</p>	<p>More relevant criteria: internationalization (learning experience, splitting the learning in different universities, different countries, different languages). That makes the difference between programs.</p> <p>Not missing criteria to add.</p>	<p>National or regional agencies should validate the criteria. As long as every university is in the European Register of Quality Assurance and any agency that is there should be trusted by the rest.</p> <p>Degrees that are led by one university, it is best to be validated by the leader and their QA.</p>	<p>The European Approach is complex, the major difficulties are bureaucracy and complexity. Not many universities use it.</p>	<p>Want to learn more about the EDL first before implementing it.</p>
<p>It should be awarded at a national level, through the national quality agency or the degree awarding powers.</p>	<p>Most relevant criteria: student centered teaching and learning and quality assurance arrangements.</p> <p>Eliminate optional criteria: have no optional criteria or all the optional criteria are mandatory. But if all the optional criteria are mandatory, then you truly make the European degree label something as a quality stamp that this program has achieved because of all these criteria.</p>	<p>The national awarding can be replicated for each country, following the European Approach. In the case of joint programs, one country could validate the criteria. It is still conservative when it comes to transborder quality assurance.</p>	<p>The most important is that the quality of joint degree programs is assured according to the ESG.</p>	<p>Problems of differentiation between EDL and the European Approach. They seem the same thing.</p>
<p>A European award could solve traditional barriers with national higher education laws.</p>	<p>Restructure. Not add more. There is a mixture in between the four areas. For ex, the qualitative criteria for student centered learning it's about dealing with AQ arrangements, and this coming from the EA for joint programs, is a structural issue.</p> <p>Consider discussion on redefinition of terms. With the mention of democratic values it is never discussed how they are translated and this dimension.</p>	<p>We need a different kind of quality assurance approach. This could be creating an external quality assurance or the development of a joint program in line with the European Approach for quality assurance.</p>	<p>The EA for joint programs is a sound methodology and can serve to externally assess the quality of joint programs. It'd be a benefit if this tool is implemented in all European higher education areas, quality assurance systems, and also in the legal frameworks.</p>	

	The joint development, implementation, and delivery criteria could be much more clearer in EDL than in EA.			
Awarding depends on the criteria and the authority checking them.	<p>Reflect on how to better distinguish the core criteria that are already covered by quality assurance at a national and international level under the umbrella of the ESG.</p> <p>There are aspects that should be clearer. For instance, the criteria on innovative learning framework is not well defined.</p> <p>Better to cover what's in the ESG and covered already.</p> <p>Define how to measure language classes or democratic values. The definition changes depending on the country.</p> <p>Some criteria are not about the label, but about the quality or the goals of a higher education system at a national or at a European level.</p> <p>Insist on joint planning and joint implementation. Planning a joint program from the beginning is something very different from putting together existing programs and making them joint. The administrative staff inclusion in all these procedures is also a very important point which is rarely raised.</p>	Not mentioned.	EA could be the best practice but it needs to be revised and updated to be implemented according to national legislations. Some specific indications for joint programs and alliances could allow evaluation with some flexibility via the normal programs.	<p>Reservations about adding another burden to the heavy process of accreditation.</p> <p>What is the purpose of the label? Who would be interested in a student having a degree with an extra label?</p> <p>Is it interesting for the person who is having a degree from a program that has this label, or only for the program itself to position itself in the landscape of the program? That's two very different things.</p>
Not mentioned.		Not mentioned.	Not mentioned.	<p>Is there really a demand for this kind of label?</p> <p>One challenge would be that this European degree label would also be eligible for all European countries,</p>

				regardless if they're part of the EU or not.
Not mentioned.	<p>Reducing criteria, not adding more.</p> <p>Some of them have to do with some European commission values, I would say not European values.</p>	Any Quality Agency in ENQA should be responsible and allowed to do this label.	Not mentioned.	<p>This idea of labels is something that is being criticized in their framework because of this virtue of stratifying the system, which is a little bit contradictory with their main mission: get a quality base for all the universities.</p> <p>Universities in some countries are not defined in terms of competition.</p>
The awarding must be at a university level, since all accredited European universities are enough mature to deliver this kind of labels.	<p>Quality assurance arrangements are the most important. Having an internal quality assurance system which is strong will help to cover all the other criteria.</p> <p>There are some differences between different countries related to the criteria or indicators. This requires collaboration to understand the particularities related to different countries.</p>	National Agencies are quite ready to implement a guide for these European degree labels and double degrees.	The EA is a very simple and concrete way to make things going further and it will not be something difficult to implement. Barriers of European countries legislations can be overlapped.	Not mentioned.
The awarding should be at the European level. Could be an ESG for EDL, or various stakeholders working together in quality assurance agencies.	<p>Not isolate higher education topics away from other missions of the university. There are no criteria concerning research, for instance.</p> <p>It's about knowing what you mean for its criteria and having the relevant indicator, not to add more criteria.</p> <p>Promote language diversity of the European higher education area.</p>	Not mentioned.	Some legislations make it possible that European University alliances use the European approach in their programs, but it makes no reference to other joint programs. So this is something which needs to be worked on in the future.	<p>Positive but challenging.</p> <p>There is an exawm to acces university degrees in different countries. How do foreign students access these degrees?</p> <p>A challenge might be a kind of rivalry between, the European degree label programs, and let's call them "conventional programs". There should be a balance.</p>
The quality agency is probably the best solution, with exceptional interventions from the European Commission.	<p>Most important criteria: mobility and European values.</p> <p>Too many criteria, advocate for a reduction of the list</p>	QA agencies should Issue the label.	Not mentioned.	Why is it necessary to have an additional label in the degrees?

<p>The award should be through a European quality agency, since they are in the business as such.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>There needs to be a clear understanding on how the European Degree Label differs from the European Approach for the quality assurance of joint programs under Bologna process, because it has the potential to cause confusion.</p>	<p>There needs to be a clear understanding of how the European degree label differs from the European approach for the quality assurance of joint programs under Bologna. It causes confusion.</p>
<p>Before deciding this, some member states must ease up on certain regimentations first, allowing flexibility.</p>	<p>EDL adds up in terms of labor market and employability. Alliances open up professional contacts to all students. Internships are easier, employability is easier contributing to the added value of the label.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>University Alliances have already requests that imply changing national regimentations. They want flexibility regarding the credits or funding of students that currently the European approach doesn't allow.</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>
<p>Definitely at the European level. So either the European Commission, but it should both be national agencies or public organisms.</p>	<p>Quality criteria are the ones with real benefits and they appeared as optional. Alternative learning formats criterion is also optional, despite the developments and the flexibility it could allow for the label. Allow flexibility. Concerns about mandatory criteria such as the question about the minimum of 30 ECTS, which is quite limiting compared to current programs; also regarding the minimum of 6 months for the mobility, which is more than the traditional mobility programs. Multilingualism is also limiting (for ex, France and the French speaking part of Belgium). Questions about the inclusion criterion: why is it and how to evaluate that.</p>	<p>Not mentioned</p>	<p>Not mentioned.</p>	<p>There are still very practical issues related with, at a national level of legal barriers and national level barriers to allow really the setup of joint degrees more generally. The micro credential question should also be included in the reflection on this level.</p>
<p>It has sense to have the awarding as close at the higher education</p>	<p>Agree with the list of criteria chosen. Not too overloaded compared to other projects.</p>	<p>If a program is accredited it is also recognized.</p>	<p>It could be possible to use the European Approach for all kinds of joint programs if</p>	

<p>level as possible. So not coming from a European institution, but closer to higher education institutions.</p>	<p>The clustering of the criteria makes sense. And most of the criteria here are already listed over there in the ESG.</p> <p>One criteria that should be included or not: transnational campus access to services. And there might be universities offering joint programs that are not able to offer all these services.</p> <p>It might be preferable to reduce the list a little bit and take out some of the services that are mentioned here to have it not too extensive and have more flexibility for universities to offer services or not.</p>	<p>Quality assurance agencies should decide the awarding.</p>	<p>national member states reform the usage of it.</p>	
<p>it's clear that the European Commission will award it. This one should not be awarded by someone who is responsible for degrees, because it's not the same as the degrees. It's also a matter of competencies.</p>	<p>One criterion would be that you use the European approach.</p> <p>Some criteria seem to be a bit valued-oriented, some national QA may be: not too many values.</p> <p>Some of them are not clear enough, it is difficult to understand how to implement them.</p>	<p>It would not make sense that the German, French and Italian quality assurance agencies together award the label, it should be someone European.</p>	<p>The European approach is a very good instrument and for some countries implementing it fully is a priority. There is no need for another instrument.</p>	<p>Do we really need it? There exist joint degrees already. What is the difference?</p> <p>Don't see the value of another label degree.</p>