



# QQI POLICY.

Procedures for the Quality Assurance of Joint  
Programmes based on the European Approach



Dearbhú Cáilíochta  
agus Cáilíochtaí Éireann  
Quality and  
Qualifications Ireland

## CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1</b> The European Approach.....	4
<b>1.2</b> Legislative Context .....	4
<b>1.3</b> Methodology and process .....	5
<b>2. STANDARDS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF JOINT PROGRAMMES IN EHEA</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.1</b> Eligibility .....	6
<b>2.1.1</b> Status.....	6
<b>2.1.2</b> Joint programme design and delivery .....	6
<b>2.1.3</b> Cooperation Agreement.....	7
<b>2.2</b> Outcomes.....	7
<b>2.2.1</b> Level [ESG1.2].....	7
<b>2.2.2</b> Disciplinary field .....	7
<b>2.2.3</b> Achievement [ESG 1.2] .....	7
<b>2.2.4</b> Regulated Professions .....	7
<b>2.3</b> Study Programme [ESG 1.2].....	7
<b>2.3.1</b> Curriculum .....	7
<b>2.3.2</b> Credits .....	7
<b>2.3.3</b> Workload.....	7
<b>2.4</b> Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4].....	8
<b>2.4.1</b> Admission .....	8
<b>2.4.2</b> Recognition.....	8
<b>2.5</b> Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3] .....	8
<b>2.5.1</b> Learning and teaching.....	8
<b>2.5.2</b> Assessment of students .....	8
<b>2.6</b> Student Support [ESG 1.6].....	8
<b>2.7</b> Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6].....	8
<b>2.7.1</b> Staff.....	8
<b>2.7.1</b> Facilities.....	8
<b>2.8</b> Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8].....	8
<b>2.9</b> Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1 & part 1] .....	9

<b>3. PROCEDURES BASED ON THE EUROPEAN APPROACH</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>3.1</b> Formal request to QQI .....	9
<b>3.1.1</b> Coordinating Institution .....	9
<b>3.2</b> Application and Eligibility .....	9
<b>3.2.1</b> Documentation submission .....	10
<b>3.3</b> The Self-Evaluation Report (SER).....	10
<b>3.4</b> Review Panel.....	10
<b>3.4.1</b> Panel members' roles .....	11
<b>3.4.2</b> Chair.....	11
<b>3.4.3</b> Panel secretary and report writer .....	11
<b>3.4.4</b> Panel Members .....	11
<b>3.4.5</b> Panel Briefing.....	12
<b>3.4.6</b> Panel planning and preparation .....	12
<b>3.5</b> Site Visit.....	12
<b>3.5.1</b> Schedule.....	12
<b>3.5.2</b> Participants .....	13
<b>3.5.3</b> Conduct of the site visit .....	13
<b>3.5.4</b> Oral Report .....	14
<b>3.6</b> Review panel report .....	14
<b>3.7</b> Formal Outcomes and Decision.....	14
<b>3.7.1</b> Report outcomes and approval.....	14
<b>3.7.2</b> Accreditation (validation).....	15
<b>3.8</b> Appeals.....	15
<b>3.9</b> Follow-Up.....	15
<b>3.10</b> Periodic Review .....	15
<b>4. APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>4.1</b> Indicative Timeline.....	16
<b>4.2</b> Resources .....	18

# 1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

## 1.1 THE EUROPEAN APPROACH

The [European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes](#) was approved by the ministers of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in May 2015. The procedure and criteria for the European approach is based on the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area](#) (ESG 2015).

Joint programmes as defined within the European Approach ‘are understood as an integrated curriculum coordinated and offered jointly by different higher education institutions from EHEA countries and leading to double/multiple degrees or a joint degree’<sup>1</sup>. Such programmes may require external quality assurance prior to being accredited or validated by the relevant institution or regulatory agency/authority. The European Approach for the quality assurance of joint programmes was developed to ease external quality assurance of these programmes.

Designated awarding bodies<sup>2</sup> and/or providers with delegated authority may make a request to QQI to conduct the external quality assurance of a joint programme according to the European Approach, these procedures are being established to enable QQI to respond to such requests to implement the European Approach.

## 1.2 LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

The quality assurance of joint programmes applying the European Approach will be conducted by QQI in accordance with Section 42 of the [Qualifications and Quality Assurance \(Education and Training\) Act 2012 \(as amended\)](#) (the 2012 Act).

Under Section 42 of the Act

42. (1) The Authority may, from time to time, conduct such reviews as it considers appropriate of the quality of education, training, research and related services provided by relevant providers and linked providers or any class of relevant providers and linked providers.
- (2) The Authority shall consult with An tÚdarás um Ard-Oideachas in carrying out a review under subsection (1) where—
- (a) that review relates to a provider referred to in that subsection, and
  - (b) that provider is an institution of higher education.
- (3) The Authority shall publish, in such form and manner as it thinks appropriate (including on the internet), the findings of a review under subsection (1).

The findings of a quality review conducted under section 42 of the Act are approved for

<sup>1</sup> [European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes \(eqar.eu\)](#) (p.1)

<sup>2</sup> Designated awarding bodies are those institutions with the authority in law to make awards. Delegated authority refers to those institutions with authority to make their own awards within the scope of the authority delegated by QQI.

publication by the Approval and Reviews Committee (ARC)<sup>3</sup> as specified within its terms of reference.

---

### 1.3 METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The methodology and process is fully aligned to the European Approach and consists of the following elements:

- i. QQI will use the 'Standards for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the EHEA' as outlined in Part B of the [European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes](#) for the single evaluation of the joint programme.
- ii. The external quality assurance of the joint programme will be conducted by QQI, in line with the process as outlined in Part C of [European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes](#).
- iii. Applying the European Approach means conducting a single evaluation process, involving one evaluation and site visit, by one panel, delivering a single report to be accepted by the co-operating institutions/other accrediting bodies under the Bucharest Communiqué.
- iv. The outcome of the process will result in a panel report with a judgement of 'compliant' or 'not compliant' in respect of the standards, as specified in the European Approach.
- v. The panel report will be considered for approval by QQI's Approval and Reviews Committee.
- vi. Based on the approved report, the decision on validation (accreditation) of the programme is made by the coordinating institution and the cooperating institutions/agencies in line with the academic regulations and/or legislative requirements within their respective jurisdictions<sup>4</sup>.

---

3 QQI Approvals and Reviews Committee Terms of Reference (June 2020). [https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-10/approvals-and-reviews-committee-terms-of-reference-june-2020\\_0.pdf](https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-10/approvals-and-reviews-committee-terms-of-reference-june-2020_0.pdf). (last accessed 03.07.2023).

4 The process for the decision on validation/accreditation differs from country to country.

---

## 2. STANDARDS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF JOINT PROGRAMMES IN EHEA

---

### 2.1 ELIGIBILITY

#### 2.1.1 STATUS

The institutions that offer a joint programme should be recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks should enable them to participate in the joint programme and, if applicable, to award a joint degree. The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

#### 2.1.2 JOINT PROGRAMME DESIGN AND DELIVERY

The joint programme should be offered jointly, involving all cooperating institutions in the design and delivery of the programme.

The programme proposal documentation should include:

- Programme name, and degree duration in years and in ECTS credits and corresponding descriptors in QF-EHEA;
- Programme aims and objectives;
- Applicant institution and the institutions in the consortium;
- Modality of teaching and main language of the programme;
- Expected incoming student numbers for first academic year;
- Programme regulations.

#### 2.1.3 COOPERATION AGREEMENT<sup>5</sup>

The terms and conditions of the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement should include:

- Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme;
- Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.);
- Admission and selection procedures for students;
- Mobility of students and staff;
- Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.

---

<sup>5</sup> [Links to templates and examples of cooperation agreements are available in 'Joint Programmes from A to Z - A reference guide for practitioners' \(2020\)](#)

## **2.2 OUTCOMES**

### **2.2.1 LEVEL [ESG 1.2]**

The intended learning outcomes should align with the Qualifications Framework of the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA) and the Irish National Framework of Qualifications (NFQ).

The intended learning outcomes should correspond to those for similar national and international programmes at the level.

### **2.2.2 DISCIPLINARY FIELD**

The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills, and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

### **2.2.3 ACHIEVEMENT [ESG 1.2]**

The programme should be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

### **2.2.4 REGULATED PROFESSIONS**

If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive, should be taken into account.

## **2.3 STUDY PROGRAMME [ESG 1.2]**

### **2.3.1 CURRICULUM**

The structure and content of the curriculum should be fit to enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

### **2.3.2 CREDITS**

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly, and the distribution of credits should be clear.

### **2.3.3 WORKLOAD**

A joint bachelor programme will typically amount to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint master programme will typically amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credit ranges according to the FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified. The workload and the average time to complete the programme should be monitored.

---

## **2.4 ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION [ESG 1.4]**

### **2.4.1 ADMISSION**

The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in light of the programme's level and discipline.

### **2.4.2 RECOGNITION**

Recognition of qualifications and of periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

---

## **2.5 LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT [ESG 1.3]**

### **2.5.1 LEARNING AND TEACHING**

The programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve those. The diversity of students and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of the students.

### **2.5.2 ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS**

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently among partner institutions.

---

## **2.6 STUDENT SUPPORT [ESG 1.6]**

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. They should take into account specific challenges of mobile students.

---

## **2.7 RESOURCES [ESG 1.5 & 1.6]**

### **2.7.1 STAFF**

The staff resources should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

### **2.7.1 FACILITIES**

The facilities provided should be sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

## **2.8 TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION [ESG 1.8]**

Relevant information about the programme, such as, admission requirements and procedures, programme handbook, examination and assessment procedures etc. should be well documented and published, taking into account the specific needs of mobile students.

## **2.9 QUALITY ASSURANCE [ESG 1.1 & PART 1]**

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.

## 3. PROCEDURES BASED ON THE EUROPEAN APPROACH<sup>6</sup>

### 3.1 FORMAL REQUEST TO QQI

In the first instance the coordinating higher education institution (HEI) should discuss with QQI the planned development of the joint programme, the proposed cooperating institutions, and the indicative timelines.

A formal request to QQI that it conduct the external quality assurance of the proposed joint programme should be made in writing by the coordinating HEI. Confirmation will be issued in writing by QQI.

#### 3.1.1 COORDINATING INSTITUTION

An Irish higher education institution will act as the coordinating institution throughout the process. QQI will liaise and communicate with the cooperating institutions through the coordinating institution.

### 3.2 APPLICATION AND ELIGIBILITY

An application with the following information is submitted to QQI in advance of the submission of the joint programme proposal for evaluation:

1. Names and administrative contact for all the cooperating institutions.
2. Documentation confirming the institutions are recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities in their own country.
3. Names and administrative contact for each of the external quality assurance agencies or relevant regulatory authorities for each of the cooperating institutions.
4. Confirmation from each of the external quality assurance agencies and/or relevant regulatory authorities of acceptance of the outcome of this process based on the European Approach.
5. The signed cooperation agreement providing all information as detailed in standard 2.1.3 above.

QQI will screen the documentation to confirm that the eligibility criteria, as outlined in the standard 2.1 above, have been met. The coordinating institution will receive formal confirmation from QQI within six weeks of submission of the documentation. QQI may contact the coordinating institution for additional information during this time.

Once eligibility is confirmed, QQI will inform the coordinating institution, and a request for payment of the cost for the conduct of the process for external QA of the joint programme will be issued.

<sup>6</sup> For resources see: [European Approach Online Toolkit](#), [ImpEA project](#) | EA quality assurance

A timeline for the submission of the self-evaluation report and review panel site visit will be discussed and agreed.

### 3.2.1 DOCUMENTATION SUBMISSION

The coordinating institution submits all documents electronically to QQI via a dedicated SharePoint site. The information will remain confidential between the coordinating institution and QQI.

---

## 3.3 THE SELF-EVALUATION REPORT (SER)

The external quality assurance process is based on the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) developed by the cooperating institutions. The SER is submitted by the coordinating institution. The SER should contain comprehensive information that demonstrates compliance with the standards as outlined in section 2 above. It is the core document used by the review panel in advance of and during, the site visit.

Furthermore, the SER should include any information about the cooperating institutions' respective national frameworks that foreign agencies and experts may require in order to understand the context, particularly the programme's placement within national higher education systems.

The SER should emphasise the joint programme's unique feature as a collaborative endeavour of higher education institutions from many national higher education systems.

Due to the collaboration and consultation necessary to prepare, draft and approve the SER, it can take substantial time to develop the report, and provision for between 6 to 9 months should be made for this within the planned timeline.

The SER will be submitted to QQI and provided to the review panel a minimum period of six weeks in advance of the site visit. The format of the SER<sup>7</sup> is not specified by QQI and may be determined by the cooperating institutions. The SER must address all the standards specified in section 2.

---

## 3.4 REVIEW PANEL

QQI will appoint a review panel of at least four members to conduct the evaluation of the joint programme. The external panel will include member(s) with subject-specific expertise, international expertise, educational expertise, QA evaluation expertise and student-related expertise. Consistent with the European Approach, the review panel will include members from at least two countries of the cooperating institutions. The review panel will include a student representative. The evaluation process and panel report will be in English, so review panel members must have sufficient English language competency.

---

<sup>7</sup> Templates are available (see the SER template developed within the ImpEA project; A useful guide to self-evaluation is also available on the ImpEA website).

QQI will select an entirely independent panel of reviewers. QQI is committed to appointing a balanced panel in terms of gender representation and including reviewers from diverse backgrounds. QQI will seek input through the coordinating institution from the cooperating institutions and/or quality agencies/appropriate authorities on the profile of the review panel.

Through the coordinating institution, the cooperating institutions and/or relevant agencies/authorities will have an opportunity to comment on the proposed composition of the review panel. QQI has final approval over the composition of the review panel.

### 3.4.1 PANEL MEMBERS' ROLES

The review panel is composed of a minimum of 4 members and is appointed and guided in line with [QQI's policy regarding the code of conduct of reviewers and evaluators](#); before being appointed, review panel members will be required to disclose any possible conflicts of interest.

### 3.4.2 CHAIR

The review panel chair acts as coordinator of the review panel and has overall responsibility for the evaluation of the joint programme. The chair will coordinate the preliminary meetings with the panel and agree the direction of discussions with stakeholders during the site visit. The chair will ensure there is sufficient discussion and evidence during the site visit to enable the panel to make a decision on 'compliance' or 'non-compliance' of the joint programme. The chair will provide an oral report on the panel's findings at the end of the site visit. The chair will liaise with the panel members and report secretary in ensuring the report is drafted within agreed timelines. Once agreed with the chair, the panel report is submitted to QQI by the panel secretary and report writer.

### 3.4.3 PANEL SECRETARY AND REPORT WRITER

The panel secretary is responsible for liaising with QQI and the coordinating institution in the preparatory stages and during the site visit, in relation to additional documentation and other requests on behalf of the panel. The review panel secretary will work closely with the chair and panel members in ensuring the necessary evidence is collected and recorded during the site visit, to enable the panel to make a decision on the joint programme. After the site visit, the panel secretary will liaise with the chair and panel members in drafting the panel report. The panel secretary will agree the final report with the chair prior to submission to QQI.

### 3.4.4 PANEL MEMBERS

The review panel members are selected for specific and diverse expertise and perspectives to contribute to the evaluation of the joint programme and panel decision. All panel members are expected to comply with QQI code of conduct and to attend briefing and preparatory meetings as scheduled. All panel members must be in attendance during the site visit.

### 3.4.5 PANEL BRIEFING

QQI will conduct an online briefing for the review panel at an early stage of the process. The aim of this briefing is to ensure that review panel members understand the:

- distinctive features of the joint programme;
- external quality process based on the European Approach;
- role of QQI, of the coordinating HEI and of the cooperating institutions in the QA of joint programmes;
- aim, objectives and guiding principles of the evaluation process;
- steps involved in the process;
- specific roles of the review panel members;
- report approval process.

### 3.4.6 PANEL PLANNING AND PREPARATION

In planning and preparing for the site visit each review panel member is requested to conduct their own independent desk analysis of the self-evaluation report and any additional material provided. The review panel will hold an online preparatory meeting at least 3 weeks in advance of the scheduled site visit. This preparatory meeting begins the process of collectively identifying general themes, issues, and areas for clarification during the site visit. An in-person private meeting of the review panel will be held the afternoon/evening before the commencement of the site visit.

Additional information may be requested by the review panel prior to or during the site visit. QQI will liaise with the coordinating institution on fulfilling any additional documentation requests made by the review panel. All documentation should be uploaded via QQI's SharePoint. Note: When uploading files and folders, the coordinating institution should be mindful of path and file name length: QQI SharePoint supports up to 260 characters for the total file and path length.

---

## 3.5 SITE VISIT

### 3.5.1 SCHEDULE

The site visit is normally restricted to one location of the coordinating HEI, although the inclusion of other locations may be facilitated through hybrid methodology. The site visit will normally take one-and-a-half days and is preceded by a preparatory meeting of the external review panel. The site visit will be conducted through English.

A proposed schedule for the site visit should be submitted by the coordinating institution for consideration by the review panel at their first on-line preparatory meeting, which will be held no later than 3 weeks in advance of the visit. The schedule of the site visit should be designed to ensure that the panel obtain a clear and explicit understanding of the approach to managing the effectiveness of the quality assurance of the joint programme.

Following any proposed changes to the schedule by the review panel, amendments may need to be made to logistical and personnel arrangements for the visit. QQI will liaise with the coordinating institution to confirm that all agreed changes are addressed appropriately in advance of the visit and will confirm the final schedule approved by the chair.

The coordinating institution should begin preparation for the site visit well in advance of the planned visit and finalise arrangements quickly thereafter. Given the complexity of engagement with cooperating institutions, the coordination of diaries can be highly complex and the attendance of participants in accordance with the schedule should be confirmed at the earliest stage possible.

### 3.5.2 PARTICIPANTS

During the site visit the review panel will meet with diverse representatives, including management, academic and non-academic staff, of the coordinating and cooperating institutions for the joint programme and learners.

The profiles of the review panel members (supplied by QQI) should be shared with all the participants in the site visit, alongside a guidance note on the process. Participants should also be informed that the review panel will guide the direction of the discussion at the meetings and some degree of flexibility may be necessary to facilitate this. Participants should have full access to the self-evaluation report and any supporting material of the joint programme.

Where a participant requires specific supports or accommodations to engage effectively in the main review visit, it is the responsibility of the coordinating institution to make this.

If simultaneous interpretation is required for any participants in the site visit, this is the responsibility of the coordinating institution to organise on behalf of the cooperating institutions.

### 3.5.3 CONDUCT OF THE SITE VISIT

To assist the chair to manage each meeting and ensure that all attendees have an opportunity to contribute to each discussion, it is recommended that the number of attendees per meeting is limited to a maximum of eight. Ideally, there should be six to eight attendees at each meeting (unless the proposed format, e.g., a world café style approach, necessitates otherwise).

The review panel and institution are encouraged to create an atmosphere of genuine dialogue throughout the main review visit. To that end, questions and discussions in meetings will be fair, courteous, and constructive, but also inquisitive, with a focus on the gathering and testing of evidence.

For open and honest discussion to occur to the best effect, attendees should consider the review panel as critical friends who are there to engage in discussion, share independent perspectives and contribute value to the review of the institution.

The review panel are tasked by QQI to ensure that by the end of each meeting they have gathered the information and evidence needed to contribute to the findings, commendations and recommendations that will be presented in the review report.

QQI representatives may attend meetings during the site visit to support the review panel and ensure smooth implementation of the process. Staff members of QQI may also be present during the site visit as observers. By agreement with the panel chair and coordinating institution, external observers may be permitted to attend some sessions.

### 3.5.4 ORAL REPORT

An oral report, detailing a brief overview of the review panel's findings is presented by the chair at the final session of the site visit. The oral report is the formal end to the site visit and process, it provides an opportunity for the chair to share preliminary findings of the panel in respect of the joint programme and compliance with the standards.

The oral report is not an opportunity for further discussions, it is a formal closure of the site visit and process by the chair.

---

## 3.6 REVIEW PANEL REPORT

The review panel prepares a report that contains relevant evidence and analysis with regard to the standards as specified in section 2. The panel's report may also make recommendations for developing the joint programme further. The conclusions and recommendations of the panel should pay particular attention to the distinctive features of the joint programme.

QQI has adapted the [Panel-report\\_template\\_impEA\\_draft.docx \(live.com\)](#) in establishing its template for the panel report<sup>8</sup>.

The cooperating institutions will be given a formal opportunity to check the factual accuracy of the review report and a template to assist in doing so will be provided by QQI.

Once the panel report has been agreed by the panel chair, it is forwarded to QQI. This must be within four weeks of the site visit. QQI maintain editorial rights over the report and will review the report for consistency and feasibility of the findings.

---

## 3.7 FORMAL OUTCOMES AND DECISION

### 3.7.1 REPORT OUTCOMES AND APPROVAL

The outcome of the process will result in a panel report with a judgement of 'compliant' or 'not compliant' in respect of the standards, as specified in the European Approach.

The final panel report is submitted to QQI's Approval and Reviews Committee (ARC) for approval. Following the decision of the ARC the coordinating higher education institution is formally notified.

QQI publishes the approved report on its website and notifies DEQAR of the outcome.

### 3.7.2 ACCREDITATION (VALIDATION)

The communication of the formal outcomes of the review process to the cooperating institutions is made by the coordinating HEI. Based on the approved report the decision on accreditation

---

<sup>8</sup> Examples of published review reports are available via Accredited/evaluated programmes - EQAR Masters degree in Global Challenges for Sustainability Masters degree in International Humanitarian Action (NOHA+)

(validation) is made by the coordinating HEI and cooperating institutions in line with the academic regulations and/or legislative framework within their own jurisdictions.

The validation (accreditation) shall be granted for a period of six years as per the European Approach. During this period, QQI should be informed of any changes in the consortium offering the joint programme.

---

### **3.8 APPEALS**

The cooperating institutions have the right to appeal against a formal outcome of the process. QQI's appeals process applies in this instance. Appealing a decision made by QQI | Quality and Qualifications Ireland

---

### **3.9 FOLLOW-UP**

QQI will agree with the cooperating institutions a follow-up procedure to address the fulfilment of conditions, and/or follow-up actions on recommendations, if applicable.

---

### **3.10 PERIODIC REVIEW**

The joint programme shall be reviewed periodically within a maximum of six years, which should be specified in the published decision. ([EA Procedure | impea project](#))

## 4. APPENDICES

### 4.1 INDICATIVE TIMELINE

Step	Action	Dates	Outcome
Preliminary consultation with the coordinating institution and QQI	Discuss proposed joint programme, the QA procedures, key actions and indicative timeline.	3 months before potential submission date of application	Actions agreed
Formal request is made to QQI to conduct the external evaluation of the joint programme	Request in writing to QQI. Formal response from QQI.	Within 2 weeks of receive request.	Process commences
Submitted application and required documentation to demonstrate 'eligibility'	Coordinating institution submits application demonstrating eligibility on behalf of coordinating institutions	Within 4 weeks	QQI confirms / denies eligibility/ requests additional information/ clarification
Once eligibility is confirmed - QQI assembles the review panel  Timeline agreed for SER submission and review visit	Review panel profile submitted by coordinating institution Proposed review panel advised to coordinating institution by QQI Feedback on any conflict of interest advised through coordinating institution.	3 – 4 months	Review panel appointed.  SER submission dates agreed.  Review visit dates agreed.
Self-Evaluation Report	Drafting SER  Submission to QQI of the SER by coordinating institution	6 months	QQI shares SER with review panel.  6 weeks before review visit
Review Panel briefing	QQI briefs the panel on QA procedures and process	4- 6 weeks	Panel briefed, access to all documentation.

Preparatory meetings by review panel	Desk review Online preparatory meeting by review panel	6 weeks 3 weeks	Topics for discussions identified. Additional documentation requirements. Schedule for site visit agreed.
Site visit (one location)	Review panel meets with relevant stakeholders	12 weeks after the receipt of ISER	Oral report is delivered by the review panel chair.
Report	Preparation of a draft report by the panel. Report is reviewed by QQI and sent to coordinating institution for a check of factual accuracy (coordinating HEI consults with all cooperating institutions) The coordinating institution responds with factual corrections. Preparation of a final report by the panel.	The draft report is sent to QQI within 4 weeks of the site visit The coordinating HEI is given a period of 15 calendar days to comment on a draft version of the report and request correction of factual errors.	QQI review report
Report Approval	The final panel report is prepared presented to QQI's Approval and Reviews Committee for approval.	Scheduled ARC date.	Report approved or not/approved for publication. QQI notifies the coordinating institution of the outcome of the ARC QQI publishes the approved report on its website, and it is uploaded to the Database of External Quality Assurance Results (DEQAR).

## 4.2 RESOURCES

- 'Joint Programmes from A to Z - A reference guide for practitioners' (2020): [Joint programmes from a to z \(impea.eu\)](https://impea.eu/joint-programmes-from-a-to-z)
- 'Manual for the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes' (VLUHR 2020): [Manual-European-Approach.pdf \(vluhr.be\)](https://vluhr.be/manual-european-approach.pdf)
- 'European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes' (Oct 2014) [European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes \(eqar.eu\)](https://eqar.eu/european-approach-for-quality-assurance-of-joint-programmes)
- 'FRAMEWORK FOR THE EUROPEAN APPROACH FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF JOINT PROGRAMMES' (Nov 2020) [Assessment\\_framework\\_for\\_the\\_European\\_Approach\\_2019\\_2025.pdf \(nvaio.net\)](https://nvaio.net/assessment-framework-for-the-european-approach-2019-2025.pdf)
- [Guide to Ex-ante accreditation of Joint programmes using the European Approach \(aqu.cat\)](https://aqu.cat/guide-to-ex-ante-accreditation-of-joint-programmes-using-the-european-approach)
- 'Conditions for the recognition by AQU Catalunya of joint programmes accreditations using the European approach framework' (2022) (available via [AQU site principal](https://aqu.cat))
- 'The European approach for QA of Joint Programmes' presentation by Lucien Bollaert at TAM Seminar Jan 2019 ([The European approach for QA of Joint Programmes - ppt download \(slideplayer.com\)](https://www.slideplayer.com/1111111/1111111-slides-the-european-approach-for-qa-of-joint-programmes-ppt-download))
- 'ECA Training: Assessing Joint Programmes' May 2022 [ECA Training: Assessing Joint Programmes – The European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education \(ecahe.eu\)](https://ecahe.eu/eca-training-assessing-joint-programmes-the-european-consortium-for-accreditation-in-higher-education)
- [European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes - Quality Assurance portal \(kuleuven.be\)](https://kuleuven.be/european-approach-for-quality-assurance-of-joint-programmes-quality-assurance-portal) (March 2022)
- Spanish Network of QA Agencies in Higher Education (REACU): 'EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR INTERNATIONAL JOINT DEGREES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes' (April 2022) [REACU-ProtocoloTitulosConjuntosInternacionales\\_en.pdf \(aac.es\)](https://aac.es/reacu-protocolo-titulos-conjuntos-internacionales-en.pdf)
- 'The European Approach For Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes - Outcomes Peer Learning Activity' (Jan 2020) [00 Final Report PLA European Approach 2-3 Dec 2019.pdf \(erasmusplus.nl\)](https://erasmusplus.nl/00-Final-Report-PLA-European-Approach-2-3-Dec-2019.pdf)
- 'European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes' approved by European Higher Education minister in May 2015 in Yerevan (adopted by the Board of AQ Austria in its 36th meeting on 20th September 2016)' [AQ-Austria\\_European-Approach\\_06112016.pdf](https://aq-austria.eu/AQ-Austria-European-Approach_06112016.pdf)
- 'Quality assurance of joint programmes' Paper presented at EQAF Nov 2021 by •Josef Matoušek, Charles University, Czech Republic • Tina Harrison, University of Edinburgh, the UK Chair: Ronny Heintze, EQAF Programme Committee ([events.html \(eua.eu\)](https://events.html(eua.eu)))

