

Version: 0.0**A. Identification and contact information**

1. Title of the proposed Joint Programme

Answer:

2. Name of the Programme / Consortium Coordinator

Answer:

3. Email

Answer:

4. Job title / Position

Answer:

5. Department / Faculty

Answer:

6. Lead Institution

*Answer:*7. Partner institution(s) *Choose from the list.**Answer:*8. Academic contact(s) in partner institutions *Name(s) and position(s).**Answer:*9. What existing provision, if any, does this programme build from? *Name the existing courses, modules or degree programmes, or state that the curriculum is being designed from scratch.**Answer:*

10. Study level of the proposed programme

- ☐ **Bachelor's degree**
- ☐ **Master's Degree**
- ☐ **Doctoral Programme**

11. Field of study

Answer:

12. Qualification model

- ☐ **Joint Degree** — a single diploma awarded jointly by all participating institutions (recommended)
- ☐ **Double Degree** — two institutions each award their own qualification
- ☐ **Multiple Degree** — three or more institutions each award their own qualification

B. Academic design13. Provide a concise description of the programme. *Include the academic rationale, what makes it distinctive, and the educational need or societal / labour-market challenge it addresses.**Answer:*

14. Summarise the key programme learning outcomes

Answer:

15. Which development approach does this proposal follow?

- ☐ **“Frankenstein” model** — building from existing courses, modules or degree programmes
- ☐ **“From scratch” model** — a newly designed curriculum around a shared educational vision
- ☐ **A combination of both**

16. Briefly explain the curriculum structure and indicative study plan. *Semesters, mobility, credit distribution, core and elective components, allocation of teaching responsibilities across partners.*

Answer:

17. Briefly explain the teaching, learning and assessment approach.

Answer:

18. Physical mobility design. *Destination(s), typical duration, format, and when it takes place in the study plan.*

Answer:

19. Other international learning opportunities. *BIPs, Challenge-Based activities, virtual mobility, guest-delivered content, micro-credentials, or other forms.*

Answer:

20. How is the programme governed? *Confirm the Joint Academic Committee's composition and how decision-making, admissions, assessment and monitoring responsibilities are shared across partners.*

Answer:

21. Quality assurance strategy. *How the programme will be monitored, reviewed and continuously enhanced across all participating institutions.*

Answer:

22. Alignment with the European Degree Criteria. *Explain how the design embeds the Criteria — joint curriculum design, integrated governance, mobility, quality assurance, and stakeholder involvement.*

Answer:

23. Expected number of students per intake, and target date for the first cohort

Answer:

24. Target date for the first cohort

Answer:

c. Resources and feasibility

25. Funding sources envisaged. *E.g. Erasmus+ for long-term mobility, INGENIUM project funds, institutional co-funding.*

Answer:

26. Institutional and accreditation route. *For each participating institution: internal approval steps, and whether accreditation will follow a national procedure or the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.*

Answer:

27. Briefly explain expected risks and mitigations

Answer:

28. Sustainability and long-term institutional commitment. *How the programme will be resourced and supported beyond the first cohort.*

Answer:

29. Is this proposal endorsed by the corresponding authorities or governing bodies at your institution?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Not yet, but the authorisation is in the process of being obtained shortly
- ☐ No, the authorisation process has not started or is delayed

30. Please confirm the endorsement.

☐ I confirm that the home institution has been informed about this proposal and commits to supporting its development.

31. Specify the name and role of the authorising person, or the name of the corresponding body.

Answer:

d. Declaration

☐ I confirm that the information in this application is accurate and reflects what was discussed during consortium and internal staff meetings.

☐ I understand that, if selected, the programme design will be finalised with the consortium, the Technical Secretariat and the corresponding teams before submission for accreditation.

☐ I confirm that the institution accepts the academic, administrative and resource implications of this proposal if it is selected, and commits to supporting its development through to accreditation.

Evaluation Committee record

FOR EVALUATION COMMITTEE USE ONLY

Pre-assessment by _____ — date: _____

Validation and selection by the Innovation Committee and Academic Committee — date:

Dimension	Score	Comments / what would strengthen it
Relevance	/ 10	
Quality	/ 10	
Impact	/ 10	
Total	/ 30	

Decision:

- ☐ **Selected**
☐ **Selected with recommendations** — see comments above
☐ **Not selected this cycle** — feedback for resubmission recorded above

2. Feedback communicated to the proposing team on

Answer:
