



STUDY PROGRAMMES ASSESSMENT

Joint Programmes

Approved by the ACPUA Evaluation, Certification and Accreditation Commission at its meeting
on 10 June 2026

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1. REGULATORY CONTEXT	3
1.2. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION PROGRAMME	4
1.3. PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT	4
2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR A JOINT DEGREE	4
3. EFFECTS, RESULTS AND LEVELS OF ASSESSMENT	6
3.1. EFFECTS OF THE EVALUATION	6
3.2. RESULTS AND LEVELS OF ASSESSMENT	6
4. EVALUATION BODIES	7
5. EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	9
6. ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE.....	12
6.1. PREPARATION FOR THE ASSESSMENT	12
6.2. APPLICATION FOR ASSESSMENT	12
6.3. INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT.....	14
6.4. EXTERNAL VISIT	14
6.5. VISIT REPORT	15
6.6. EVALUATION REPORT.....	16
6.7. COMMUNICATION OF THE RESULTS	17
6.8. OFFICIAL REGISTRATION (ARAGONESE UNIVERSITIES)	17
6.9. META-EVALUATION	17
6.10. PUBLICATION	18
7. GUARANTEES COMMITTEE.....	18
8. RECOGNITION PROCEDURE.....	18
9. MONITORING AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	19
DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY	20

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Regulatory context

The European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, adopted by the ministers responsible for higher education within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in 2015, provides the framework for the external evaluation of international joint degree programmes delivered by higher education institutions in different countries.

This approach was developed with the aim of fostering the development and recognition of joint degree programmes by establishing assessment standards and procedures based on the common instruments of the European Higher Education Area, thereby avoiding the cumulative application of additional national requirements and promoting integrated assessment procedures that adequately reflect the international and joint nature of these programmes.

In Spain, quality assurance for official university programmes is organised through external evaluation procedures that encompass both the evaluation prior to the implementation of study programmes and the evaluation of programmes already in place. Consequently, international joint degrees seeking recognition as official programmes must comply with the requirements set out in Spanish regulations and by the competent authorities responsible for universities¹.

The European Approach serves as the reference framework for the evaluation of those joint degree programmes in which a university from the Aragon University System participates alongside other higher education institutions within the European Higher Education Area. It may also be applied to joint degree programmes developed with higher education institutions located outside the EHEA, provided this is agreed upon by the participating institutions and the agencies responsible for external quality assurance.

The institutions participating in a joint degree programme must agree on the agency responsible for the external evaluation of the programme from among those agencies listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR)². In this context, the Aragon Agency for University Quality and Prospective Studies (ACPUA), as an agency listed in the aforementioned European register, may carry out the evaluation of international joint degree programmes in accordance with the European Approach, as well as recognise, under the terms set out in this programme, evaluations carried out by other agencies registered with EQAR.

The implementation of this programme contributes to strengthening mutual trust between higher education systems, facilitates the international recognition of joint degrees and promotes the continuous improvement of the quality of teaching delivered through international cooperation.

¹ Royal Decree 822/2021 of 28 September, establishing the organisation of university education and the procedure for ensuring its quality.

² <https://www.eqar.eu/register/agencies/>

1.2. Scope of the evaluation programme

This programme, which applies to both new international joint degree programmes and those already in place, establishes the framework for the external evaluation of degree programmes developed jointly by universities and higher education institutions in different countries.

Depending on the status of the programme under evaluation, two categories are distinguished:

- **Newly created joint degree³** : the evaluation focuses on assessing the potential quality of the proposed programme, analysing the suitability of its design, academic structure, coordination mechanisms, planned resources and quality assurance systems prior to its implementation.
- **Existing joint degree programme⁴** : the evaluation focuses on assessing the **actual quality of the programme**, taking into account its development, outcomes, the functioning of coordination and quality assurance mechanisms, as well as the extent to which the intended learning objectives and outcomes have been achieved.

1.3. Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to present to the stakeholders involved in the evaluation process of joint programmes (universities, teaching staff, administrative and support staff, students, employers, evaluation committees, authorities with responsibilities in the field of higher education, and other interested groups) both the procedure to be followed and the aspects that will be assessed during the evaluation.

2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR A JOINT DEGREE

Prior to the start of the evaluation procedure, the coordinating university and the participating institutions must verify that the international joint degree programme meets the minimum eligibility criteria required for its evaluation under this programme.

In accordance with the principles set out in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, primary responsibility for the quality and legal compliance of the proposal lies with the institutions forming the consortium. Consequently, they must ensure that the programme meets the required academic, organisational and regulatory requirements before submitting the application for evaluation to ACPUA.

To this end, the joint degree must meet at least the following conditions:

a. Institutional recognition of the participating institutions

All institutions involved in delivering the joint degree must be officially recognised as higher education institutions by the competent authorities in the countries in which they operate.

³ Ex ante evaluation or verification

⁴ Ex-post evaluation or renewal of accreditation

Furthermore, these institutions must hold the necessary authorisations and powers to participate in the programme and, where applicable, to jointly or jointly issue the corresponding degrees.

b. Existence of a formal consortium agreement

The participating institutions must have formalised a consortium agreement or convention governing, at least, the following aspects included in the self-assessment report:

- The programme's governance and coordination structure.
- The distribution of roles and responsibilities amongst the participating institutions.
- The procedures for student admission and selection.
- Mechanisms for student and staff mobility.
- The academic assessment and grading systems.
- Procedures for the award and recognition of qualifications.
- Internal quality assurance and dispute resolution mechanisms.

The agreement must remain in force throughout the programme's implementation period and adequately reflect the commitment and obligations undertaken by each of the institutions forming part of the consortium.

c. Effective participation of all consortium institutions

All participating institutions must play an active role in the design, development, delivery, monitoring and improvement of the joint degree.

Institutional participation must be consistent with the programme's academic objectives and demonstrate an effective contribution to the development of teaching activities, academic management and quality assurance processes.

d. Guarantee of legal recognition of the degree

Participating institutions must analyse in advance the applicable legal and academic requirements in the various countries involved, ensuring that the programme's structure allows for the recognition and validity of the joint degree in accordance with the regulations in force in each jurisdiction.

e. Adequacy of the self-evaluation documentation

The Self-Evaluation Report must provide sufficient information to understand the institutional and regulatory context in which the programme is delivered, incorporating those elements of the national higher education systems that are necessary for the expert panel to carry out a proper evaluation.

Furthermore, the report must highlight the distinctive features that characterise the programme as a degree developed jointly by institutions belonging to different national higher education systems.

3. EFFECTS, RESULTS AND LEVELS OF ASSESSMENT

3.1. Effects of the evaluation

Accreditation granted under this programme shall be valid for six years, in accordance with the principles and criteria set out in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

During this period, participating institutions must notify ACPUA of any relevant changes affecting the consortium responsible for the joint degree or any substantial aspects of the programme, including, amongst others, changes to its academic structure, nature, learning outcomes or coordination mechanisms.

In order to ensure that the conditions under which accreditation was granted are properly maintained, ACPUA may carry out follow-up assessments during the period of validity of the accreditation. As a minimum, a follow-up review will be conducted three years after the programme's initial launch, with the aim of analysing the changes introduced and assessing their impact on the quality and development of the joint degree programme.

3.2. Results and levels of assessment

3.2.1. Evaluation outcome

The outcome of the evaluation process for international joint degrees governed by this programme will take the form of an evaluation report, which may result in one of the following outcomes:

- Favourable
- Favourable with conditions
- Unfavourable

The report will be based on the degree of compliance with the evaluation standards and guidelines set out in this programme.

Outcome	Criteria for issuing the report
Favourable	The evaluation concludes favourably and a favourable assessment of the joint degree is recommended. All standards have been assessed as satisfactory by the evaluation panel.
Favourable with conditions	The evaluation concludes favourably, subject to compliance, within the established timeframe, with the aspects highlighted in the report. One or more standards present shortcomings that require corrective action, although the panel considers that these can be rectified and that the degree programme can fully meet the required quality standards. The responsible institution or consortium must demonstrate compliance with the established

	conditions within the set timeframe. Failing this, the outcome of the evaluation may be reviewed.
Unfavourable	The evaluation concludes unfavourably. The non-compliances detected affect one or more standards to such an extent that the panel considers it impossible to guarantee, within a reasonable timeframe, compliance with the required quality standards.

3.2.2. Assessment of evaluation standards

In order to substantiate the final outcome of the evaluation process, each of the standards included in this programme will be assessed according to the following levels:

- Met
- Partially met
- Not met

The assessment of the various standards will serve as the basis for the final evaluation report and for the formulation, where appropriate, of recommendations, areas requiring particular monitoring and mandatory compliance requirements.

Level of compliance	Criteria for assessing the standard
Met	The standard is satisfactorily met. The evidence provided confirms that the joint degree fully meets the quality requirements and expectations established for that standard.
Partially met	The standard is met in its fundamental aspects, although certain weaknesses or areas for improvement have been identified. The panel considers that these shortcomings can be rectified and that full compliance with the standard can be achieved within a defined timeframe through the implementation of appropriate corrective measures.
Not met	The standard is not met. The available evidence reveals significant shortcomings that prevent the standard from being considered met. The panel considers that it is not possible to guarantee full compliance within a reasonable timeframe through improvement measures.

4. EVALUATION BODIES

The Degree Programme Evaluation Sub-Committee (hereinafter SET) is responsible for issuing the evaluation report.

To carry out this task, the SET will seek the technical judgement of a panel of experts appointed ad hoc for this process, who will possess the appropriate experience and knowledge to assess the academic, organisational and quality characteristics of the programme.

In particular, the panel must include individuals with experience in the field or fields of knowledge covered by the degree programme, knowledge of the relevant professional environment and labour market, experience in quality assurance in higher education, and student representation.

Generally speaking, the panel will consist of at least four experts, in addition to one person who will act as technical secretary.

Overall, the panel must have sufficient knowledge of the higher education systems represented within the consortium responsible for the joint degree. Furthermore, efforts shall be made to ensure that the panel includes representatives from at least two of the countries involved in delivering the programme. Where official recognition of the degree requires validation by the Spanish authorities, efforts shall be made to ensure the participation of at least one expert with proven knowledge of the Spanish higher education system.

Where appropriate to facilitate the international recognition of the evaluation, ACPUA may invite observers or experts proposed by other quality assurance agencies involved, without prejudice to the independence of the evaluation panel.

In general, the composition of the panel shall be as follows:

- Chair: a person of recognised academic standing and experience in the field of knowledge covered by the degree programme under evaluation.
- Academic member: an expert in the fields of knowledge or disciplines being assessed.
- Professional member: a professional with relevant experience in the professional field linked to the degree programme.
- Student member: a student or recent graduate with experience in higher education and the ability to provide the students' perspective.
- Technical Secretary: an expert in evaluation methodology and quality assurance, responsible for providing technical support to the panel throughout the process.

As the evaluation procedure and associated documentation may be conducted in English, panel members must demonstrate a sufficient level of linguistic competence to enable them to analyse the documentation, participate in meetings and draft the relevant reports.

ACPUA will notify the coordinating university of the proposed composition of the evaluation panel in order to identify any potential situations of incompatibility or conflict of interest. Should any circumstances be detected that could compromise the independence of the evaluation, the Agency will take the appropriate measures. Final approval of the panel's composition rests with ACPUA.

Prior to carrying out their duties, ACPUA will provide the experts with the necessary training and information on the evaluation procedure, the duties associated with each role, and the specific

aspects involved in the evaluation of international joint degrees through the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

All those participating in this evaluation shall sign the Agency's code of ethics.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria included in this programme correspond fully to the standards set out in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. To facilitate their consultation and application within the context of the Aragon University System, these standards are incorporated into this document via a Spanish translation carried out by ACPUA. This translation is purely for practical purposes and does not alter the content, scope or interpretation of the standards approved by the European Higher Education Area, which in all cases constitute the official reference for the evaluation of international joint degree programmes.

The application of the evaluation standards will take into account the stage of development of the programme under evaluation. In the case of newly established joint degree programmes (ex ante evaluation), the assessment will focus on the suitability of the design, planning and mechanisms put in place to ensure the quality of the degree programme. In the case of joint degree programmes already in place (ex-post evaluation), the assessment will also be based on evidence derived from their actual implementation, including outcomes, indicators, monitoring mechanisms and evidence of the programme's operation.

To guide the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report, ACPUA recommends consulting the documentation available on the ImpEA (Implementation of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes) project website, which sets out and illustrates the content, evidence and aspects to be considered for each of the evaluation standards of the European Approach (<https://impea.eu/guide-for-self-evaluation-report/>).

1. ELIGIBILITY

The institutions that offer a joint programme should¹ 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.

1.2 Joint design and delivery

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

1.3 Cooperation Agreement

The terms and conditions of the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement should in particular cover the following issues:

- *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 teachers
- Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.

2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

2.1 Level [ESG 1.2]

The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualifications framework(s).

2.2 Disciplinary field

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

2.3 Achievement [ESG 1.2]

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

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.

3. STUDY PROGRAMME [ESG 1.2]

3.1 Curriculum

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

3.2 Credits

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

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.

4. ADMISSION AND RECOGNITION [ESG 1.4]

4.1. Admission

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

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.

5. Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3]

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.

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.

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.

7. RESOURCES [ESG 1.5 & 1.6]

7.1 Staff

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

7.2 Facilities

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

8. TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION [ESG 1.8]

Relevant information about the programme like admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc. should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

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.

6. ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

The purpose of this section is to describe the sequence of activities to be carried out by the various stakeholders involved in the evaluation process for an international joint degree, with a view to ensuring transparency and the smooth running of the application, organisation and evaluation tasks.

6.1. Preparation for the assessment

Prior to the start of the evaluation process, ACPUA may hold an orientation meeting with the coordinating university of the international joint degree programme.

The purpose of this meeting will be to provide information on the evaluation procedure, the applicable criteria and standards, the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report, the required documentation, the planned timetable for actions and the specific characteristics of the consortium responsible for the programme, as well as to resolve any issues that may arise in relation to the conduct of the evaluation process.

Furthermore, where the international nature of the programme so requires, ACPUA may establish contacts and mechanisms for collaboration with the relevant quality assurance agencies in the countries or territories in which the institutions forming part of the consortium are based. The purpose of these actions will be to promote coordination between agencies, facilitate the involvement of experts with knowledge of the university systems concerned, and identify any potential constraints arising from national regulatory frameworks that might affect the evaluation process or the recognition of its results.

This preparatory phase will help to ensure that the evaluation is carried out in accordance with the principles and criteria set out in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes and with full respect for the legal frameworks of the participating institutions. Institutionally accredited institutions

6.2. Application for assessment

The application for evaluation shall be submitted by the coordinating university of the international joint degree programme to ACPUA, accompanied by the documentation required for the evaluation process.

Where the joint degree programme does not involve a university from the University System of Aragon, or where specific circumstances arise relating to funding, the programme's international scope or its unique nature, the evaluation may require the prior formalisation of an agreement between ACPUA and the institution coordinating the joint degree programme, setting out the conditions for conducting the procedure and the responsibilities of the parties.

In order to ensure the proper planning of the evaluation process, the application must be submitted at least 10 months in advance of the programme's planned launch date or, in the case

of programmes already in place, at least 10 months before the expiry of the previous accreditation period.

6.2.1. Self-Assessment Report

The external evaluation procedure is based on the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), drawn up jointly by the institutions participating in the international joint degree programme.

The Self-Assessment Report is one of the central elements of the evaluation process, as it provides the panel of experts with the information necessary to analyse the programme and prepare for the external evaluation visit.

The report must be drawn up in English, unless ACPUA and the participating institutions expressly agree on another working language, and must include sufficient, up-to-date and verifiable information to demonstrate the degree of compliance with the standards and evaluation criteria established for this programme.

In general, the Self-Evaluation Report must:

- Have been drawn up and validated jointly by all the institutions forming part of the consortium.
- Include comprehensive and substantiated information on compliance with the quality standards applicable to the joint degree.
- Incorporate the information necessary to understand the regulatory and institutional context of the various higher education systems involved.
- Highlight the distinctive features that characterise the programme as a degree developed jointly by institutions belonging to different university systems.

The Self-Assessment Report will serve as the main source of information for the documentary assessment and for the preparation of the external visit; it must therefore provide sufficient evidence regarding the design, implementation, operation and outcomes of the international joint degree programme.

Due to the high degree of coordination, consultation and consensus required for the preparation, drafting and approval of the Self-Evaluation Report, its preparation may take a considerable amount of time. For this reason, it is recommended that the participating institutions allow a period of between six and nine months for its preparation.

The template for the Self-Evaluation Report is included as Annex I to this document. The report must address all the standards, criteria and guidelines set out in the relevant evaluation guide.

The Self-Evaluation Report must be submitted to ACPUA at least two months before the scheduled date of the external evaluation visit. Should the documentation provided be deemed incomplete or insufficient to adequately assess all the areas subject to evaluation, ACPUA may decide to suspend or postpone the visit until the necessary information is available to carry out the process with due rigour.

6.3. Individual assessment

The members of the evaluation panel will carry out an individual evaluation of the joint degree programme, taking into account all the standards set out in the evaluation guide.

During this phase, particular attention must be paid to those elements that specifically characterise international joint degree programmes, an aspect which must be reflected in the panel's assessments.

The individual assessment must be based on the evidence provided by the participating institutions and must incorporate, amongst other elements:

- The relevant evidence identified during the documentary analysis.
- The analysis carried out for each assessment standard.
- An assessment of the degree of compliance with the standards.
- The identification of good practices.
- Areas for improvement.
- Recommendations aimed at strengthening and continuously improving the programme.

6.4. External visit

The purpose of the external visit is to enable the evaluation panel to verify the information contained in the self-evaluation report and to assess the degree of compliance with the evaluation standards applicable to the joint international degree programme.

During the visit, the panel will request information on the programme's characteristics, examining in greater depth those aspects that require clarification or a more detailed assessment, and addressing the issues that have arisen during the preliminary analysis of the documentation.

The format, duration and composition of the hearings scheduled during the visit will be determined in accordance with the nature of the evaluation and the characteristics of the joint degree programme under evaluation.

In the case of newly created joint degree programmes (ex ante evaluation), the purpose of the visit will be to verify the suitability of the programme's design, the robustness of the planned coordination mechanisms, the adequacy of the resources committed, and the feasibility of the planned actions to ensure the quality of the degree programme. Generally speaking, the visit may be conducted virtually and will involve, at a minimum, the institutional and academic leads for the programme, those responsible for the quality assurance systems, and any other relevant personnel whose participation is necessary to assess the viability of the proposal.

In the case of established joint degree programmes (ex-post evaluation), the purpose of the visit will be to assess the effective functioning of the programme and to verify the evidence provided in the Self-Evaluation Report. Generally speaking, it may take place in person, in a hybrid format or online, and will involve the main stakeholders associated with the degree programme.

In ex-post evaluations, and where applicable depending on the programme's characteristics and stage of implementation, the following groups may participate in the evaluation meetings:

- Governance representatives from the participating institutions.
- Academic staff and personnel involved in the coordination and management of the joint degree programme.
- Teaching staff involved in delivering the programme.
- Those responsible for quality assurance processes.
- Enrolled students.
- Staff responsible for student support services.
- Graduates.
- Representatives from the professional sector and other relevant stakeholders.

The composition of the panels should seek to reflect the diversity of participating institutions, academic profiles, educational pathways and national origins represented within the programme.

The visit will generally take place at the institution coordinating the joint degree programme, without prejudice to the participation of other institutions within the consortium where the international nature of the programme so requires. It will usually last one day and will be preceded by a preparatory meeting of the evaluation panel. Where the visit takes place in person, it will include a tour of the facilities and material resources that are particularly relevant to the delivery of the programme. In cases where the evaluation panel deems it necessary to assess relevant infrastructure, equipment or resources located at other participating institutions, it may request additional documentary or audiovisual evidence, hold specific meetings with the relevant managers, or agree on other measures to enable these resources to be assessed with due rigour. In exceptional cases, where the nature of the programme or the facilities so warrants, ACPUA may request that a member of the panel visit those facilities without it being necessary for all members to travel there.

The working language of the evaluation process shall generally be English.

The panel shall draw up a provisional programme for the visit, which may be adjusted by the coordinating university, subject to the panel's approval. The programme must ensure that the necessary information is obtained so that the evaluation can be carried out with due safeguards.

The organisation of the meetings and hearings scheduled during the visit shall be the responsibility of the coordinating university and the institutions participating in the programme, in accordance with the guidelines set out by the evaluation panel.

Prior to, during or following the visit, the evaluation panel may request additional information or documentation where it considers this necessary to properly substantiate its assessments. Such requests must be duly justified, and the institutions responsible for the joint degree programme must provide the required information within the specified timeframe.

6.5. Visit report

Once the external visit has been completed, the evaluation panel shall draw up the corresponding visit report, in accordance with the template established by ACPUA. This report

must include the evidence, analysis and conclusions relating to each of the evaluation standards set out in this programme. Furthermore, the conclusions must pay particular attention to the elements that specifically characterise international joint degree programmes.

In addition to the rationale behind the assessments carried out, the report may include the following elements:

- **Good practices:** Particularly relevant or innovative aspects identified in the joint degree programme which, due to their quality or uniqueness, may serve as best practice examples or be transferable to other programmes with similar characteristics.
- **Conditions:** Significant shortcomings that affect compliance with one or more standards and which must be rectified in order to guarantee the quality of the programme. These conditions may, where appropriate, result in a conditional favourable overall evaluation outcome.

The coordinating university may submit representations regarding these conditions during the relevant stages of the evaluation procedure.

- **Areas for improvement:** Aspects where there is room for improvement and which it is advisable to address in order to strengthen the programme. Although they may be significant, they do not directly compromise compliance with the evaluation standards. The coordinating university may submit representations regarding these areas for improvement.
- **Recommendations:** Suggestions made by the panel with the aim of promoting continuous improvement and the future development of the joint degree programme. The implementation of the recommendations is voluntary and will not affect the outcome of the evaluation. The recommendations are not subject to appeal.

Prior to its submission to ACPUA, the content of the report must be agreed upon by all members of the panel and validated by the chair.

Upon receipt of the report, ACPUA will carry out a technical review to verify the internal consistency of the assessments made and the adequate justification for the proposed outcome. Where necessary, the Agency may request further clarification from the panel or additional justification for specific assessment judgements.

6.6. Evaluation report

The visit report will then be submitted to the Degree Programme Evaluation Sub-Committee (SET). The SET is the body responsible for issuing the draft evaluation report on the evaluation process for international joint degree programmes, based on the visit report drawn up by the evaluation panel.

The SET will draw up the corresponding draft report, taking into account the criteria set out in the section on evaluation results and levels for this programme.

The final outcome may be:

- Favourable

- Favourable with conditions
- Unfavourable

Furthermore, the report may include, where appropriate:

- Best practice
- Conditions
- Areas for improvement
- Recommendations

In carrying out its duties, the SET may, giving reasons, disagree with the assessments included in the visit report where there are sufficiently justified grounds for doing so. In such cases, it may request additional information, clarifications or further justification for the assessments made from the evaluation panel before formulating its proposed resolution.

The draft evaluation report shall be forwarded to the coordinating university for its information. The institution shall have a period of twenty working days to submit any representations or comments it deems appropriate.

Once the representations submitted have been analysed, the SET will submit the final proposal, accompanied, where appropriate, by a document responding to the representations made. If the university does not submit any representations within the established time limit, the draft report shall be deemed final.

6.7. Communication of the results

ACPUA will communicate the outcome of the evaluation to the coordinating university of the joint degree programme and, where applicable, to the quality assurance agencies or participating institutions involved in the procedure.

6.8. Official registration (Aragonese universities)

In the Spanish context, the university must process the verification or renewal of the degree programme's accreditation in accordance with the procedures established by current regulations. Once the relevant application has been received, ACPUA will forward the final evaluation report issued under this programme to the Council of Universities for consideration as part of the relevant procedure.

6.9. Meta-evaluation

Once the evaluation process has been completed, ACPUA will inform the panel of experts and make the **final evaluation report on the joint programme** available to them.

The experts and the evaluated institutions will be invited to complete a satisfaction survey regarding the process.

The results of this survey will be analysed as part of the meta-evaluation process by the Evaluation, Certification and Accreditation Commission (CECA), which may agree on any improvements it deems necessary to the process.

6.10. Publication

The final evaluation reports issued under this programme will be published in accordance with the principles of transparency and accountability that underpin quality assurance processes within the European Higher Education Area. Specifically, they will be published on the ACPUA website and in the Database of External Quality Assessment Results of the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

7. GUARANTEES COMMITTEE

Should ACPUA become aware of any complaint or appeal relating to this evaluation process, the management will refer the matter to the Agency's Guarantees Committee for its information and action.

Information relating to the Guarantees Committee and the procedure for handling appeals, complaints and claims in the context of follow-up can be found on the ACPUA website.

8. RECOGNITION PROCEDURE

Joint degree programmes may select an evaluation agency listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR). Aragonese universities participating in a joint degree programme evaluated by an EQAR-registered agency other than ACPUA must follow a recognition procedure in accordance with the following steps:

- The Aragonese university must submit the relevant application via the general procedure established for universities' dealings with ACPUA.
- The institution must attach the following documentation to the application:
 - The external evaluation report issued by the EQAR agency responsible for the evaluation.
 - The agreement or memorandum of understanding for the joint degree programme.
 - The self-evaluation report submitted for assessment.
- ACPUA will issue a formal report stating that the degree programme has been evaluated by an agency registered with EQAR and that the procedure followed has been carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

9. MONITORING AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Although monitoring is an internal process for the participating institutions, it is a mandatory procedure and the resulting reports constitute essential evidence for future accreditation processes.

ACPUA will collaborate with the participating institutions in establishing a monitoring procedure aimed at ensuring compliance with the established requirements and/or the implementation of the areas for improvement identified during the evaluation process.

Document revision history

Rev. No.	Date	Changes made
0	10 June 2026	CECA approval.