



EUROPEAN
UNIVERSITY
ALLIANCE

Joint European Degree Label Criteria

4EU+ Self-Assessment Form

4EU+ ETERNITY

June 2026

The following 4EU+ joint European degree label self-assessment form is designed to support directors, coordinators and other staff of joint programmes in reviewing and strengthening their programme while seeking to produce an outlook on how compatible their programme is with the aforementioned criteria. Its purpose is to be used as a practical quality assurance and self-reflection tool, helping them to identify in which areas the alignment with the criteria is significant and where on the other hand additional development is needed.

The main purpose of this self-assessment form is not to indicate mere compatibility but to initiate self-reflection and subsequent enhancement. Joint programmes are complex and operate across different institutions and national systems, spanning several years, and benefitting from gradual development. This form is therefore intended to help coordinators take a structured look at the programme, identify what works well, and recognise areas where changes, clarification, or additional documentation may be required.

Closely following the official Operational Guide developed within the European Degree Policy Lab, this document goes slightly beyond mere indication (yes/no) of compliance. To serve its purpose, it allows a more elaborate expression of the criteria's fulfilment as well as a space for short written complementary explanations. This allows the joint programme coordinators to describe their programme in a more nuanced and personalized way, including partial or uncertain compliance, ongoing developments, or planned improvements. Respondents are also asked to refer to relevant documentation, which supports an evidence-based approach to quality assurance.

By completing the form, coordinators are invited to reflect on key aspects of their joint programme through the lens of the aforementioned criteria. This includes considering how the programme is organised and governed, for example the involvement of at least

two higher education institutions from different countries, joint design and delivery of the curriculum, joint policies and decision-making, and internal and external quality assurance arrangements. It also includes reviewing how the programme supports student learning and experience, for example through student-centred learning, embedded mobility opportunities, co-supervision of dissertations, and equitable access to campus services. Finally, it involves assessing how the programme incorporates the broader European dimension, including interdisciplinarity and research-based learning, employability and learning beyond academia, digital skills, adherence to European values, multilingualism, inclusiveness, and environmental sustainability. Reflecting on these criteria facilitates identification of the programme's strengths, areas for further development, and opportunities for enhancement in alignment with European standards.

The self-assessment form is structured in five main parts:

First section: IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT	Purpose: collects basic information about the person completing the form on behalf of the programme, including their role and responsibilities
Second section: IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROGRAMME	Purpose: gathers key identification information about the joint programme itself
Third section: COMPLIANCE WITH THE CRITERIA	Purpose: contains the criteria and indicators for the joint European degree label. For each criterion and indicator, respondents are asked to indicate the level of compliance, provide a brief explanatory statement, and identify sources of evidence in formally codified documentation such as consortium agreements, accreditation documents, joint diploma templates, quality assurance reports, or other relevant institutional or consortium-level documents.

Fourth section: CONCLUDING SELF-REFLECTION STATEMENT	Purpose: provides space for concluding self-reflection statement. This is the opportunity to provide more detailed commentary on any of the criteria, especially those where compliance is not fully achieved. Coordinators can also raise any concerns regarding measurability, programme-specific characteristics, or other information that may be useful for evaluators. This section allows context and insights that go beyond the structured indicators.
Fifth section: ATTACHMENTS	Purpose: provides space to upload attachments. Here, respondents should upload all supporting documentation referenced in the previous sections, creating a clear evidence portfolio to substantiate your self-assessment

Overall, this self-assessment form is intended as a self-reflection mechanism, providing not only a structured statement about the state of the programme, but inviting an identification of key areas that remain to be further developed. By doing so, it aims to facilitate evidence-based quality enhancement in the alliance, focusing on the joint educational offer, one of the principal elements of 4EU+, and helping it align with the highest and up-to-date standards of the European Education Area.

Examples: how to comply with the criteria and demonstrate it?

The following sections provide practical guidance to help you check whether your joint programme meets the criteria for the European Degree Label.

For each criterion, you will find:

- an explanation of what the criterion means in practice,
- a short list of key elements to focus on when designing or reviewing your programme,
- examples of how compliance can be demonstrated, based on typical programme and consortium documentation.

These examples are not prescriptive. Joint programmes can meet the criteria in different ways, depending on their field, level (EQF 6, 7, 8), size, and delivery model.

Use the examples as a reference point to identify strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement in your programme.

Example 1: CRITERION A7: TRANSNATIONAL CAMPUS – ACCESS TO SERVICES

What this really means

Think of your programme as one shared campus - even if it runs across several countries. Your goal is simple: students and staff should be able to use services at every partner institution, under the same conditions as local students and staff.

This should work throughout the whole programme - whether participants are on-site, online, or moving between institutions.

What you should aim for

If you want your programme to meet this criterion, focus on three things:

1. Access to physical facilities during mobility

When students or staff are physically at a partner institution, they should be able to use key facilities just like local users.

This includes, for example:

- labs
 - study spaces
 - libraries
2. Access to IT services throughout the programme

Participants should not “lose access” when they move between institutions. Make sure they can use:

- learning platforms
- online libraries
- virtual or hybrid classrooms
- other digital tools needed for their studies or work

3. Access to support services

Students and staff should be able to access relevant support services across the consortium.

These may include:

- social and financial support system
- academic and career support
- wellbeing and counselling services
- housing and integration support
- Ombudsman office
- international offices (visa, onboarding, practical matters)

How to show that you meet the criterion

You need to demonstrate that this is clearly organised and actually works in practice.

You can do this through:

- Consortium agreement defining joint policies, responsibilities, and mechanisms ensuring equivalent access to services across institutions
- Programme level documentation, such as handbooks or guides, clearly outlining participants' entitlement to services at each partner institution
- Quality assurance documentation, including programme review reports and annual monitoring, addressing accessibility and adequacy of services
- Feedback and monitoring data, including student and staff surveys, user satisfaction reports, and documented follow-up actions related to access to services

Example 2: CRITERION B1: INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND RESEARCH-BASED LEARNING

What this really means

Your programme should give students the opportunity to go beyond a single discipline and/or actively engage in research.

This does not mean that the entire curriculum must be interdisciplinary.

Instead, think of it as ensuring that at least one meaningful part of the programme allows students to:

- combine perspectives from different fields, and/or
- learn through research, investigation, or problem-solving.

The key is that this is planned, visible in the curriculum, and assessed, not incidental.

What you should aim for

If you want your programme to meet this criterion, focus on three things:

1. Clear learning outcomes

Your intended learning outcomes should explicitly include:

- interdisciplinary competences (e.g. integrating knowledge/methods/perspectives from different fields), and/or
- research skills (e.g. inquiry, analysis, use of methods)

These should be visible at programme and/or course level.

2. Alignment between learning and assessment

It is not enough to include these elements in teaching - they must also be properly assessed.

Make sure that assessment methods (e.g. projects, reports, thesis, presentations) are clearly linked to interdisciplinary and/or research-based learning outcomes.

3. At least one structured learning component

Your programme should include at least one clearly defined and documented component where students engage in interdisciplinary and/or research-based learning.

This component should be a compulsory part of the curriculum, ensuring that all students benefit from this experience (not only those who select specific electives).

This may take different forms, for example:

- Interdisciplinary course or module
- challenge-based or problem-based project
- collaborative project across disciplines or institutions
- supervised research project or thesis
- laboratory work or fieldwork

- inquiry-based or research-oriented course

The format can vary, what matters is that it is intentional, structured, and part of the curriculum.

How to show that you meet the criterion

You need to demonstrate that this is clearly designed, implemented, and assessed.

You can do this through:

- Programme documentation, including consortium agreement and curriculum descriptions, indicating the presence of interdisciplinary and/or research-based components
- Course catalogues and syllabi, clearly describing learning outcomes, credits, teaching methods, and assessment aligned with interdisciplinary and/or research-based learning
- Operational evidence, such as student project descriptions, thesis guidelines, laboratory or fieldwork documentation, demonstrating how such learning is implemented in practice
- Quality assurance and review documentation, confirming the design, delivery, and continuous improvement of interdisciplinary and/or research-based learning components

Example 3: CRITERION B3: DIGITALISATION

What this really means

Your programme should ensure that students develop the digital skills they need for their studies, future careers, and everyday life in a digital society.

There is no single model to follow. The type of digital skills will depend on your field and level (EQF 6, 7, or 8).

What matters is that digital competences are actually accessible to students during the programme

These skills can be developed within the curriculum or through additional learning opportunities offered by the partner institutions.

What you should aim for

To meet this criterion, your programme should ensure at least one of the following is in place:

1. Digital skills integrated into the curriculum

Students develop digital competences as part of their regular studies.

This may include:

- use of discipline-specific tools (e.g. software, data analysis, digital methods)
- digital research or project work
- learning activities where digital tools are an essential part of the course

OR

2. Additional opportunities to develop digital skills

Students can access opportunities outside (or alongside) the core curriculum to strengthen their digital competences. These opportunities are typically offered through central services or institutional provision at partner institutions, and made accessible to joint programme students.

These may include:

- workshops or short training courses
- certifications
- use of learning platforms and collaborative online tools
- virtual labs, simulation software, or other digital environments

In both cases, digital competences can include:

- field-specific skills
- as well as broader digital literacy, such as information management, digital communication, ethical use of technology, cybersecurity, and digital wellbeing

The approach does not need to be identical across all partners.

How to show that you meet the criterion

You need to demonstrate that at least one of these approaches is clearly defined and available to students.

You can do this through:

- Consortium-level and programme documentation, outlining the integration of digital competences within curricular and/or extracurricular provision
- Programme handbook, curriculum descriptions, course catalogues, and syllabi, specifying learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment related to digital skills
- Operational evidence, such as descriptions of training activities, workshops, or access to digital tools and platforms provided by partner institutions
- Quality assurance and review documentation, confirming that digital competences are addressed, monitored, and continuously enhanced within the programme

Example 4: CRITERION B7: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

What this really means

Your programme should show a clear commitment to environmental sustainability in two ways:

- how the programme is organised and delivered, and
- what students learn

This does not mean you need to redesign your entire curriculum around sustainability.

Instead, think of it as ensuring that:

- your programme actively reduces its environmental impact where possible, and
- students have real opportunities to develop relevant green skills.

What you should aim for

To meet this criterion, your programme should address two complementary areas:

1. Sustainable programme operations

You should take practical and coordinated steps to reduce the environmental footprint of your programme.

This is especially important for:

- mobility between partner institutions
- joint activities (e.g. meetings, teaching, events)

Measures may include, for example:

- use of virtual or hybrid formats where appropriate
- encouraging more sustainable travel options
- reducing unnecessary travel
- paperless administration and digital processes
- sustainable event organisation

These measures should be realistic and not compromise academic quality or inclusiveness.

The programme should also consider its long-term sustainability and efficient use of resources, ensuring that organisational and financial arrangements support continuity and responsible management over time.

2. Opportunities to develop green skills and competences

Students should have opportunities to learn about sustainability in ways that are relevant to the programme.

This does not need to be a core focus in all disciplines. What matters is that opportunities are:

- meaningful and appropriate to the field
- aligned with the programme's learning outcomes and graduate profile

These may be provided, for example, through:

- courses or modules related to sustainability (e.g. environmental policy, sustainable technologies, impact assessment)

- integration of sustainability topics into existing courses where relevant
- transversal opportunities such as:
 - institution-wide modules
 - micro-credentials
 - seminars or guest lectures

How to show that you meet the criterion

You need to demonstrate that both operational measures and learning opportunities are clearly defined and implemented.

You can do this through:

- Consortium agreement outlining joint policies and responsibilities related to sustainability in programme operations and student learning
- Programme documentation, such as handbook, curriculum overview, course catalogue, and syllabi, detailing green skills and competences and corresponding learning outcomes
- Operational evidence, including sustainability reports, guidance documents on sustainable mobility or event management, and records of footprint-reduction measures implemented across partner institutions
- Quality assurance and review processes, confirming the integration and monitoring of sustainability measures and student learning opportunities

Glossary

This glossary has been prepared for the internal purposes of the 4EU+ Alliance. It lists the most common terms used in connection to the European Degree initiative. Its purpose is to provide elementary explanations and highlight differences in their meanings. To avoid interpretation disputes, the definitions and explanations are based on already existing policy oriented materials, analyses, and guidelines. Note that as the policy making processes on European level develops, the emphasis of different terms might shift or they might be redefined - but as of 2025, these sources provide very accurate guidance for people whose expertise is not transnational studies.

Joint European Degree

The final shape and definition of the concept of 'joint European degree' is to be determined when the Council decides to take steps towards its introduction, following the analysis of the Commission's evaluation report on the implementation of the joint European degree label and the feasibility study on the joint European degree as described in the Council Resolution on a joint European degree label and the next steps towards a possible joint European degree: boosting Europe's competitiveness and the attractiveness of European higher education. At this stage, it can be defined as follows: A joint degree awarded to students to certify the completion of a joint programme delivered by two or more higher education institutions from different countries, including at least two EU Member States. The joint programme leading to the award of the joint European degree meets a common set of European criteria and is quality assured according to the ESG and the European Approach, which should facilitate automatic recognition in the EU. Where required by national qualification frameworks, the joint European degree may be integrated into national legislation to facilitate its implementation across the countries of the participating institutions.

Council Recommendation on a European quality assurance and recognition system in higher education, p. 35

(<https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-8672-2025-INIT/en/pdf>)

Joint European Degree label

A quality label granted to joint programmes delivered through transnational cooperation between higher education institutions from different countries, including at least two EU Member States, to act as a branding tool, promoting compliance with European standards and providing visibility and prestige to the labelled joint programmes. The label is granted based on common European criteria following an assessment by competent accreditation

or quality assurance authorities, such as self-accrediting universities, accreditation agencies, or quality assurance bodies.

Council Recommendation on a European quality assurance and recognition system in higher education, p. 35

(<https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-8672-2025-INIT/en/pdf>)

European criteria

The European criteria in Annex II set out the key features of the joint European degree label and guarantee the respect of the highest standards to offer transnational programmes and showcase the specific European nature of such a label. These criteria are neither mandatory nor legally binding, but to ensure mutual trust, the joint European degree label is only awarded when all these criteria are met.

Council Recommendation on a European quality assurance and recognition system in higher education, p. 4 (<https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-8672-2025-INIT/en/pdf>)

Joint programme

Joint programmes are understood as an integrated curriculum coordinated and offered jointly by different higher education institutions (...), and leading to double/multiple degrees or a joint degree.

EQAR <https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/definitions/>

A joint programme is a programme offered jointly by several higher education institutions. These institutions can be located either in the same country or in different countries (...). A joint programme does not necessarily lead to a joint degree. It is only one of the possible awards. (...)

One of the products of the intergovernmental Bologna Process, the 2012 Implementation Report (p.185), indicates that joint programmes have all or at least some of the following characteristics:

- *The programmes are jointly developed and/or approved by several institutions;*
- *Students from each participating institution study parts of the programme at other institutions;*
- *The students' stays at the participating institutions are of comparable length;*
- *Periods of study and exams passed at the partner institution(s) are fully and automatically recognised;*
- *Professors of each participating institution also teach at the other institutions, jointly work out the curriculum, and form joint admission and examination commissions;*
- *After completion of the full programme, the student either obtains the national degrees of each participating institution or a degree awarded jointly by them.*

[Joint programmes from A to Z - A reference guide for practitioners](#), p. 11.

Joint degree

Joint degree: A single document awarded by higher education institutions offering the joint programme and nationally acknowledged as the recognised award of the joint programme.

EQAR <https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/definitions/>

The joint degree is a single document awarded by higher education institutions offering the joint programme. This degree is acknowledged as the recognised award of the joint programme in all relevant countries. Since it is a joint award, this means that it is presented

as a single document. The joint degree replaces typical institutional or national degrees and it therefore must be nationally acknowledged as the recognised award of the joint programme. This also means that the joint degree is issued and signed as stipulated in the relevant national legislation, i.e. signed by the competent authorities (rector, vicechancellor, etc.) as the representatives of the institutions involved in the joint degree.

[Recognition of qualifications from joint programmes](#), p. 17.

Double/multiple degree

Double/multiple degrees: Separate degrees awarded by higher education institutions offering the joint programme attesting the successful completion of this programme (if two degrees are awarded by two institutions, this is a 'double degree').

EQAR <https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/definitions/>

When higher education institutions involved in offering the joint programme award separate documents after successful completion of this joint programme, this award is referred to as a multiple degree. It is important to stress here that only the combination of the separate documents should be regarded as the degree. It is in fact a multiple degree because there are multiple documents that combine to create the degree; not because a graduate receives multiple individual degrees. In reality, in most higher education systems it is difficult to distinguish a degree awarded for a regular programme from a document awarded as part of a multiple degree. This means that generally a multiple degree is perceived as a combination of several individual degrees.

Erasmus Mundus joint master degrees: The story so far,
<https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6f52e9bb-31f2-11e6-b497-01aa75ed71a1>, p. 37

Dual degree

A double degree is a type of multiple degree but here only two documents are awarded. Double degrees are often referred to in one breath with dual degrees. Where double degrees are awarded by joint programmes, dual degrees are not. Dual degrees are awarded for two programmes separately. These two programmes have some coordination and coordinated elements but, contrary to joint programmes, the curriculum is not integrated and not jointly offered. In case of a dual degree, each institution is primarily responsible for its own curriculum and its own degree. Dual degrees have also been awarded by single institutions offering their students “efficiencies in course taking”.

Erasmus Mundus joint master degrees: The story so far,
<https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/6f52e9bb-31f2-11e6-b497-01aa75ed71a1>, p. 37

European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes

In 2015, the ministers of higher education approved the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (EA) at the Yerevan conference, with the aim of simplifying European joint programme external review processes. The European Approach defines common standards based on the tools of the European Higher Education Area, without applying any additional national criteria. With this methodology, degrees are assessed in only one of the degree programme's participating countries, with this assessment being recognised by the rest of the countries offering the degree.

<https://www.aqu.cat/en/Universities/Programmes-Assessment/International-interuniversity-programs-European-Approach>

Under the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, a single quality assessment will suffice for programmes to obtain accreditation in all the countries of the

European Higher Education Area in which programme accreditation is mandatory. (...) This European approach comprises a single framework with standards and procedures for the assessment of international joint programmes. Such joint programmes, which are taught by institutions in several countries, may carry either a single joint degree or several national degrees.

<https://www.nvao.net/en/european-approach-for-quality-assurance-of-joint-programmes>

European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes: approach that has been approved in May 2015 by European Ministers responsible for higher education and that has been developed to ease external quality assurance of these programmes: it defines standards that are based on the agreed tools of the EHEA, without applying additional national criteria. The approach is expected to facilitate integrated approaches to quality assurance of joint programmes, which genuinely reflect and mirror their joint character. The approach is available at:

https://www.eqar.eu/assets/uploads/2018/04/02_European_Approach_QA_of_Joint_Programmes_v1_0.pdf

Council Recommendation on a European quality assurance and recognition system in higher education, p. 34

(<https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-8672-2025-INIT/en/pdf>)

Legal status

The European Commission launched the European strategy for universities in 2022 where it suggests that European Universities should explore deeper cooperation also in terms of a legal statute. A joint legal entity of the alliance would assist in consolidating strengths, making collective strategic decisions, unifying operation, and facilitating pooling of

resources, activities, and data. This would support deeper, long-term, and flexible cooperation by allowing the sharing of capacities, exchange of personnel [...].

A European university legal entity has multiple potential advantages for an alliance. These range from general economies of scale to more strategic benefits. A legal entity can help save costs through joint procurement and centralised services. It can also enable true sharing of resources, most notably through employing staff directly in the legal entity that are serving the entire alliance without ties to partner universities.

The financial aspect is also relevant as the legal entity can assume a role in external funding in e.g. Horizon Europe, where an alliance is normally not eligible as a beneficiary. Some of the alliances have made the legal entity responsible for grant management in EUI and others. The entity can also serve as a centralised fundraising organisation and enable joint investments. It can also function as a handler of internal funding, such as for seed funding for smaller projects.

[European universities and legal entities – why and why not to do it | Laurea Journal](#)

INSTRUCTION ON THE PURPOSE OF THE JOINT EUROPEAN DEGREE LABEL 4EU+ SELF- ASSESSMENT FORM

Joint European degree label is a mark of excellence available to transnational joint programmes. This label is awarded to programmes that are compatible with the corresponding set of criteria, which were approved by the Council of the European Union

in 2025. The criteria, attached as an annex to this document, build on existing tools in EU and EHEA that focus on transnational joint programmes, namely European Standards and Guidelines and European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. The programmes that decide to pursue the label can individually apply to be assessed, and in case of positive result, can issue special certification to students upon their graduation (in addition to their diploma), and use corresponding set of visuals when promoting the programme (logo etc.).

The following 4EU+ joint European degree label self-assessment form is designed to support directors, coordinators and other staff of joint programmes in reviewing and strengthening their programme while seeking to produce an outlook on how compatible their programme is with the aforementioned criteria. Its purpose is to be used as a practical quality assurance and self-reflection tool, helping them to identify in which areas the alignment with the criteria is significant and where on the other hand additional development is needed.

The self-assessment form is the core document in the application for the Joint European Degree Label as it provides the foundation for the assessment panel's evaluation of the programme's compliance with the established criteria.

However, the main purpose of this self-assessment form is not to indicate mere compatibility but to initiate self-reflection and subsequent enhancement. Joint programmes are complex and operate across different institutions and national systems, spanning several years, and benefitting from gradual development. This form is therefore intended to help coordinators take a structured look at the programme, identify what works well, and recognise areas where changes, clarification, or additional documentation may be required.

Closely following the official Operational Guide for the Joint European Degree Label developed within the European Degree Policy Lab, this document goes slightly beyond mere indication (yes/no) of compliance. To serve its purpose, it allows a more elaborate expression of the criteria's fulfilment as well as a space for short written complementary explanations. This allows the joint programme coordinators to describe their programme in a more nuanced and personalized way, including partial or uncertain compliance, ongoing developments, or planned improvements. Respondents are also asked to refer to relevant documentation, which supports an evidence-based approach to quality assurance.

By completing the form, coordinators are invited to reflect on key aspects of their joint programme through the lens of the aforementioned criteria. This includes considering how the programme is organised and governed, for example the involvement of at least two higher education institutions from different countries, joint design and delivery of the curriculum, joint policies and decision-making, and internal and external quality assurance arrangements. It also includes reviewing how the programme supports student learning and experience, for example through student-centred learning, embedded mobility opportunities, co-supervision of dissertations, and equitable access to campus services. Finally, it involves assessing how the programme incorporates the broader European dimension, including interdisciplinarity and research-based learning, employability and learning beyond academia, digital skills, adherence to European values, multilingualism, inclusiveness, and environmental sustainability. Reflecting on these criteria facilitates identification of the programme's strengths, areas for further development, and opportunities for enhancement in alignment with European standards.

The self-assessment form is structured in five main parts:

First section: IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT	Purpose: collects basic information about the person completing the form on behalf of the programme, including their role and responsibilities
Second section: IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROGRAMME	Purpose: gathers key identification information about the joint programme itself
Third section: COMPLIANCE WITH THE CRITERIA	Purpose: contains the criteria and indicators for the joint European degree label. For each criterion and indicator, respondents are asked to indicate the level of compliance, provide a brief explanatory statement, and identify sources of evidence in formally codified documentation such as consortium agreements, accreditation documents, joint diploma templates, quality assurance reports, or other relevant institutional or consortium-level documents.
Fourth section: CONCLUDING SELF-REFLECTION STATEMENT	Purpose: provides space for concluding self-reflection statement. This is the opportunity to provide more detailed commentary on any of the criteria, especially those where compliance is not fully achieved. Coordinators can also raise any concerns regarding measurability, programme-specific characteristics, or other information that may be useful for evaluators. This section allows context and insights that go beyond the structured indicators.
Fifth section: ATTACHMENTS	Purpose: provides space to upload attachments. Here, respondents should upload all supporting documentation referenced in the previous sections, creating a clear evidence portfolio to substantiate your self-assessment

Overall, this self-assessment form is intended as a self-reflection mechanism, providing not only a structured statement about the state of the programme, but inviting an identification of key areas that remain to be further developed. By doing so, it aims to facilitate evidence-based quality enhancement in the alliance, focusing on the joint

educational offer - one of the principal elements of 4EU+ - and helping it align with the highest and up-to-date standards of the European Education Area.

JOINT EUROPEAN DEGREE LABEL

CRITERIA: SELF-ASSESSMENT FORM

Background

This self-assessment form has been developed under the 4EU+ ETERNITY Project, funded by the Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange (NAWA). Its purpose is to support coordinators and staff of joint programmes in evaluating their compliance with the criteria for the joint European degree label, as outlined in the Council Recommendation on a European Quality Assurance and Recognition System in Higher Education.

The form provides a structured approach to self-evaluation, helping programmes systematically review evidence and assess their alignment with the Operational Guide for the Joint European Degree Label, developed by the European Commission and Policy Lab. The form is divided into sections covering identification details, programme information, and a set of criteria grouped under the organisational and European dimensions of joint programmes. Respondents are asked to indicate their level of compliance, provide short explanatory statements, and reference relevant supporting documentation.

First section: IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT

In section one we ask questions relevant for the identification of the person submitting the form on behalf of the joint programme. It is advised to enter information about your function within the programme, however this question remains open.

Name and surname	
Email address	

Function	
Affiliation	

Second section: IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROGRAMME

In this section we ask questions relevant for the identification of the joint programme.

Official programme name	
EQF level:	
Degree type	
Programme discipline(s):	
Language(s) of instruction:	
Year of establishment:	
Current accreditation status of the programme (running – accredited programme with students already enrolled, new – programme which undergoes its first quality assurance and might have not yet enrolled students)	

European Approach evaluation - has the programme undergone, is currently in the process, or is planning to undergo accreditation via European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes? If your programme is already accredited with European Approach please state the year of accreditation.	
Lead institution:	
Consortium partners involved:	

Third section: COMPLIANCE WITH THE CRITERIA

The purpose of this section is to provide evidence and measure the extent of compliance of a joint programme with the criteria for the joint European Degree Label. Each question in this section pertains to one of the European criteria to be met by joint programmes and specific indicators that measure compliance with it.

OVERLAPS OF THE CRITERIA WITH EUROPEAN APPROACH FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF JOINT PROGRAMMES

Regarding overlaps with the European Approach, criteria can be divided into three categories:

The criterion is fully met if the programme underwent the accreditation via European Approach. It means that it does not need to be verified separately again by the evaluators.

European Approach addresses this criterion to some extent or can provide information that will serve as basis for assessment, but still needs to be verified by the evaluators.

The criterion is not covered at all by the European Approach and needs to be fully assessed by the evaluators.

These overlaps are relevant for the process of formal assessment of the programmes, which will be done by quality assurance agencies or verified institutions carrying internal accreditation in line with ESGs.

In this self-assessment form there are three markers - stars - that indicate with each criterion what is its status regarding the coverage by the European Approach:

	Fully covered by European Approach - criterion will not be separately assessed, considered fulfilled
	Partially covered by the European Approach, will be partially assessed
	Not covered by European Approach, will be fully assessed

INSTRUCTIONS: HOW TO COMPLETE THE FORM

The self-assessment form should be prepared according to the following principles:

1. Collaborative approach: The process should involve all degree-awarding partners and it shall include input from staff, students,
2. Evidence-based: Every claim should be supported by direct references to the documents contained in the evidence portfolio.
3. Clear and concise: It should be comprehensive while remaining focused and succinct.

For each criterion there is a separate sub-section with specified indicator(s). Per each criterion and each indicator person filling the self-evaluation form should indicate three things:

1. Level of compliance with the indicators - choose one from the following options that corresponds the most to the circumstances of the programme in question:
 - Fully complies – 100% proven beyond doubt
 - Mostly complies – 80% compliance is reasonably proven with remaining areas of improvement
 - Somewhat complies – >50% the minimal necessary requirements are met
 - Does not comply – 0-50% the programme does not comply
 - Insufficient evidence/not sure – there is no way how to measure the compliance with specific indicator(s) of the criterion, or no documents to back it up; or person filling the form does not know whether programme complies with specific indicator(s) of the criterion
2. Statement: in this section, provide a short written explanation of the indicated level of compliance. *Example: Criterion 1: We comply with this criterion because our consortium is composed of 5 HEIs situated in 5 different EU member countries.*
3. Source of evidence: in this section provide information on where evidence of compliance with specific indicators of the criterion can be found. In order to qualify as evidence, sources given should be part of officially codified joint programme documentation such as consortium agreement, accreditation documentation or quality assurance reports (the full list of the evidence base and sources is described in more detail in the Operational Guide for the Joint European Degree Label and Annex 5: Mapping of indicators to assess compliance with the criteria of the Joint European Degree Label). Compliance with some of the criteria

can also be attested through information embedded in documentation pertaining to wider structures such as university internal status and other commitments made by the consortium, institutions, or alliances. *Example: Criterion 1: Consortium agreement, accreditation documentation, joint diploma template, joint diploma supplement.* Sources provided in this section should be uploaded in the last section of this form.

DIMENSION A - PROGRAMME ORGANISATION CRITERIA: OPERATIONAL AND QUALITY ASSURANCE ASPECTS

CRITERION A1: HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED. The joint programme is offered by at least 2 higher education institutions from at least 2 different Member States (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS ☒ At least two higher education institutions from two EU Member States or EEA EFTA States (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway) offer the joint programme in a degree-awarding role.	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A2: TRANSNATIONAL JOINT DEGREE DELIVERY.	
Subcriterion A2.1: Joint design and delivery. The joint programme is jointly designed and jointly delivered by all the higher education institutions involved (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The joint programme is offered jointly, involving all cooperating institutions in its design and delivery.	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:
Subcriterion A2.2: Joint degree. The joint programme leads to the award of a joint degree (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	

INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ Each graduate of the joint programme receives a joint degree.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:
Subcriterion A2.3: Joint diploma supplement. A joint Diploma Supplement is issued to students (EQF 6, 7)	
Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ A joint Diploma Supplement is issued to each graduate.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:
Subcriterion A2.4: Use of ECTS Users' Guide. The joint programme describes the learning outcomes and credits in line with the ECTS Users Guide	

(EQF 6, 7)	
Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) is applied properly, and the distribution of credits is clear.	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A3:

JOINT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PROGRAMME.

The joint programme has joint policies, procedures and/or arrangements defining curriculum planning and delivery, as well as all organisational and administrative matters. Students' representatives are part of the decision-making process to define the joint policies and procedures and/or arrangements.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for both indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. The joint programme has joint policies, procedures and/or arrangements covering curriculum planning and delivery, as well as organisational and administrative matters.	Fully complies
2. Students' representatives are included in the decision-making process.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A4: QUALITY ASSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS.	
Overlap with European Approach	

Subcriterion 4.1: Internal and external quality assurance.

Internal and external Quality Assurance is conducted in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). The higher education institutions, the field of study or the programme are evaluated by a EU quality assurance agency registered in the EQAR or a EU agency fully implementing the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence that the joint programme has already undergone, or is simultaneously undergoing, an evaluation by an EQAR-registered QA agency or by self-accrediting HEIs evaluated at the institutional level by an EQAR-registered agency. This criterion is covered by that evaluation and therefore does not need to be re-assessed.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source	Answer:

Subcriterion 4.2: European Approach.

The joint programme is evaluated using the standards of the European approach for quality assurance of joint programmes (European Approach)

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence that the joint programme has already undergone, or is simultaneously undergoing, an evaluation using the European Approach procedure.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A5: GRADUATE TRACKING. The joint programme monitors graduates through a graduate tracking system or using data collected by the European Higher Education Sector Observatory. (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ The criterion is met if the joint programme has (plans for) a mechanism for regular graduate tracking which is used/to be used to inform the continuous enhancement of the programme.	Fully complies

Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A6: STUDENT-CENTRED LEARNING. The joint programme is designed and continuously enhanced and delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in the learning process. Assessment of students reflects this approach (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for both indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. The learning and teaching approaches are designed to achieve the intended learning outcomes while respecting student diversity.	Fully complies

2. The student assessment (examination regulations and methods) correspond with intended learning outcomes across all partner institutions. .	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A7: TRANSNATIONAL CAMPUS – ACCESS TO SERVICES. The programme has joint policies for students and staff to have access to relevant services in all participating higher education institutions under conditions equivalent to those for all enrolled students and local staff (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for all of the following indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE

1. The programme has joint policies for students and staff to have access to relevant services in all participating HEIs under conditions equivalent to those for all enrolled students and local staff.	Fully complies
1. Students and staff of the joint programme have equitable access to relevant physical infrastructure and facilities during their mobility periods.	Fully complies
2. Students and staff of the joint programme have equitable access to relevant support services during their mobility periods.	Fully complies
3. Students and staff of the joint programme have equitable access to relevant IT services for the whole duration of the programme.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION A8:

FLEXIBLE AND EMBEDDED STUDENT MOBILITY

Subcriterion 8.1: 30 ECTS physical mobility.

The joint programme offers student physical mobility of at least 30 ECTS (that can be split over several stays) at one or more partner institution(s). The joint programme has a policy offering alternatives for students who are unable to travel, such as virtual exchanges and/or blended mobility

(EQF 6, 7)

Overlap with European Approach



INDICATORS

☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for **both** indicators:

LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE

1. The joint programme offers an embedded physical mobility component of at least 30 ECTS.

Fully complies

2. Joint arrangements are in place at the programme-level setting out alternatives for students unable to travel.

Fully complies

Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:
Subcriterion 8.2: Six months physical mobility. The joint programme offers at least 6 months of physical mobility at one or more partner institution(s). The joint programme has a policy offering alternatives for students who are unable to travel (EQF 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for both indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. The joint programme offers mobility opportunities among consortium partners with a total duration of at least six months.	Fully complies
2. Alternative arrangements are set out in a policy for doctoral candidates unable to travel.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:

Source of evidence	Answer:
--------------------	---------

CRITERION A9: CO-EVALUATION AND CO-SUPERVISION FOR DISSERTATIONS. Dissertations are supervised by at least 2 supervisors and co-evaluated by co-supervisors or a committee with members from at least 2 different institutions located in 2 different countries. (EQF 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for both indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. Each doctoral candidate is supervised by at least two supervisors from two different degree-awarding institutions located in different countries	Fully complies

2. The evaluation committee, nominated by two different consortium partners, includes members from at least two different institutions in two different countries.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

DIMENSION B - EUROPEAN DIMENSION CRITERIA: EUROPEAN VALUES AND PRIORITIES OF THE JOINT PROGRAMME

CRITERION B1: INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND RESEARCH-BASED LEARNING. The joint programme's arrangements include embedded interdisciplinarity and/or research-based learning components, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme. (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
Overlap with European Approach	★

INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for interdisciplinary components and/or research-based learning activities described in the joint programme documentation.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION B2:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEARNING BEYOND ACADEMIA AND EMPLOYABILITY.

The joint programme's arrangements foresee opportunities to broaden the learning experience of students beyond the academic context, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme, including labour market requirements incorporating inter-sectoral components or activities and development of transversal skills.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for at least one of the indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. Work experience, internships, volunteering, research collaborations, projects with industry partners, or other engagement with relevant external stakeholders are embedded in the curriculum of the joint programme.	Fully complies

2. Relevant professionals are involved in recurring educational roles within the joint programme.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION B3:

DIGITALISATION.

The joint programme's arrangements include opportunities for students to develop adequate digital skills and competence, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for at least one of the indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. Integration of digital skills development into the joint programmes' curriculum.	Fully complies
2. Opportunities provided to students to enhance their digital skills outside of their curriculum.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION B4:

VALUES.

The joint programme's arrangements adhere to the values of the EHEA (academic freedom, academic integrity, institutional autonomy, student and staff participation in higher education governance, public responsibility for higher education, and public responsibility of higher education) and include a commitment to promote common European values and democratic citizenship.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if: The joint programme is covered by a declaration that reflects its commitment to the core values of the EHEA (academic freedom, academic integrity, institutional autonomy, student and staff participation in higher education governance, public responsibility for higher education, and public responsibility of higher education) and to promoting common European values and democratic citizenship.	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION B5:

MULTILINGUALISM.

The joint programme's arrangements offer opportunities to equip each student with language skills through exposure to at least 2 different eu languages during learning activities or mobility.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

Overlap with European Approach	
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for at least one of the indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. Use of at least two EU languages in curricular components and/or extracurricular activities of the joint programme.	Fully complies
2. Structured opportunities for language learning are defined and offered by the consortium partners, including courses and/or mobility opportunities to countries where a different EU language is spoken.	Fully complies

Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION B6: INCLUSIVENESS	
Overlap with European Approach	
Subcriterion B6.1: Diversity, Equality and Inclusion. The joint programme's arrangements include a commitment to wide participation by fostering diversity, equality, and inclusion and by adopting tailored measures to support students and staff with fewer opportunities. (EQF 6, 7, 8)	
INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ The criterion is met if the joint programme has a documented inclusion policy.	Fully complies
☒ AND if there is evidence supporting at least one of the following indicators:	

1. Specific interventions or support programmes designed for students with fewer opportunities are in place at programme-level, institutional level or cross-institutional level and are applicable to the joint programme.	Fully complies
2. Mechanisms to monitor and assess the inclusiveness of the joint programme are in place at programme-level, institutional level or cross-institutional level and are applicable to the joint programme.	Fully complies
3. Funding mechanisms and procedures are assigned specifically to inclusion measures.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:
Subcriterion B6.2: European Charter for Researchers. The joint programme's arrangements include a commitment to respect the principles of the European Charter for Researchers. (EQF 8)	

INDICATORS	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence of documented commitment to the principles of the European Charter for Researchers expressed by the consortium partners.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

CRITERION B7:

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY.

The joint programme's arrangements include policies and actions related to environmental sustainability and implement measures to minimise the environmental footprint of its activities, and foresee opportunities for students to develop adequate green skills and competences, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme.

(EQF 6, 7, 8)

Overlap with European Approach	★
INDICATORS ☒ The criterion is met if there is evidence for both indicators:	LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE
1. Arrangements on sustainability and reducing environmental impact are in place at programme level, institutional level or cross-institutional level and are applicable to the joint programme.	Fully complies

2. The joint programme provides students with curricular or transversal opportunities to develop skills and expertise regarding environmental sustainability, ecological preservation, and neutral resource management.	Fully complies
Statement	Answer:
Source of evidence	Answer:

Fourth section: CONCLUDING SELF-REFLECTION STATEMENT

Instructions how to fill it in: this is an opportunity for you to go into more details in terms of any of the criteria. You are encouraged to focus on those areas in which the compliance is not 100%. You can also express any concerns connected to the measurability, specifics of your programme in question, or generally any information that might be useful for the evaluators.

General remarks

Fifth section: ATTACHMENTS

Upload attachments here

European criteria for a joint European degree label (source: [Annex II to the Council Recommendation of 12 May 2025 on a European quality assurance and recognition system in higher education](#))

European criteria for a joint European degree label		EQF Level s
A. Programme Organisation Criteria		
A1.Higher education institutions involved	The joint programme is offered by at least 2 higher education institutions from at least 2 different Member States.	6, 7, 8
A2.Transnational joint degree delivery	The joint programme is jointly designed and jointly delivered by all the higher education institutions involved.	6, 7, 8
	The joint programme leads to the award of a joint degree.	6, 7, 8
	A joint Diploma Supplement is issued to students.	6, 7
	The joint programme describes the learning outcomes and credits in line with the ECTS Users Guide.	6, 7
A3.Joint arrangements for the joint programme	The joint programme has joint policies, procedures and/or arrangements defining curriculum planning and delivery, as well as all organisational and administrative matters.	6, 7, 8

	Students' representatives are part of the decision-making process to define the joint policies and procedures and/or arrangements.	
A4. Quality assurance arrangements	Internal and external Quality Assurance is conducted in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). The higher education institutions, the field of study or the programme are evaluated by a EU quality assurance agency registered in the EQAR or a EU agency fully implementing the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.	6, 7, 8
	The joint programme is evaluated using the standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (European Approach).	6, 7, 8
A5. Graduate tracking	The joint programme monitors graduates through a graduate tracking system or using data collected by the European Higher Education Sector Observatory.	6, 7, 8
A6. Student-centred learning	The joint programme is designed and continuously enhanced and delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in the learning process. Assessment of students reflects this approach.	6, 7, 8
	The programme has joint policies for students and staff to have access to relevant services in all participating higher education institutions under	6, 7, 8

A7. Transnational campus – access to services	conditions equivalent to those for all enrolled students and local staff.	
A8. Flexible and embedded student mobility	The joint programme offers student physical mobility of at least 30 ECTS (that can be split over several stays) at one or more partner institution(s). The joint programme has a policy offering alternatives for students who are unable to travel, such as virtual exchanges and/or blended mobility.	6, 7
	The joint programme offers at least 6 months of physical mobility at one or more partner institution(s). The joint programme has a policy offering alternatives for students who are unable to travel.	8
A9. Co-evaluation and co-supervision for dissertations	Dissertations are supervised by at least 28 supervisors and co-evaluated by co-supervisors or a committee with members from at least 2 different institutions located in 2 different countries.	
B. European Dimension Criteria		
B1 Interdisciplinarity and research based learning	The joint programme's arrangements include embedded interdisciplinarity and/or research based learning components, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme.	6, 7, 8

B2 Opportunities for learning beyond the academia and employability	The joint programme's arrangements foresee opportunities to broaden the learning experience of students beyond the academic context, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme, including labour market requirements incorporating inter-sectoral components or activities and development of transversal skills.	6, 7, 8
B3 Digitalisation	The joint programme's arrangements include opportunities for students to develop adequate digital skills and competence, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme.	6, 7, 8
B4 Values	The joint programme's arrangements adhere to the values of the European Higher Education Area (academic freedom, academic integrity, institutional autonomy, student and staff participation in higher education governance, public responsibility for higher education, and public responsibility of higher education) and include a commitment to promote common European values and democratic citizenship.	6, 7, 8
B5 Multilingualism	The joint programme's arrangements offer opportunities to equip each student with language skills through exposure to at least 2 different EU languages during learning activities or mobility.	6, 7, 8
B6 Inclusiveness	The joint programme's arrangements include a commitment to wide participation by fostering diversity, equality, and inclusion and by adopting tailored measures to support students and staff with fewer opportunities.	6, 7, 8

	The joint programme's arrangements include a commitment to respect the principles of the European Charter for Researchers.	8
B7 Environmental sustainability	The joint programme's arrangements include policies and actions related to environmental sustainability and implement measures to minimise the environmental footprint of its activities, and foresee opportunities for students to develop adequate green skills and competences, tailored to the nature and circumstances of the joint programme.	6, 7, 8