

## **Quality Assurance Board (QAB) – Academic Management Board (AMB) Meeting**

Date: 12 January 2026

Time: 13:00

Format: Online meeting

### **1. Participants**

1. Dovydas Benevicius (VU, chair of the iPSRS QAB)
2. Alain Tremeau (UJM QAB member)
3. Pasi Vahimaa (UEF QAB member)
4. Régis Fournier (UPEC QAB member)
5. Teagan Kilian (M2 student iPSRS QAB member)
6. Holly Lewis (M1 student iPSRS QAB member)
7. Destouches Nathalie (AMB member)
8. Vlaxopanagiotis Elena (AMB member)
9. Mathieu Roussay (AMB member)
10. Augustas Vaitkevičius (AMB member)

### **2. Agenda**

1. **Selection Process and Appeal Procedures**
2. **Student Level Evaluation (Arrival) Test and Scholarships**
3. **Conditions for EMJM Scholarship withdrawal**
4. **Examination Scheduling**
5. **Feedback from Teaching Staff**
6. **Monitoring of Students' Learning Outcomes**
7. **Project-Specific KPIs Monitoring**
8. **Next Steps and Upcoming Meetings**

### **3. Discussions and Key Points**

#### **3.1 Selection Process and Appeal Procedures**

The QAB and AMB discussed the increasing number of applications and the expected rise in appeals as candidate numbers grow.

The QAB highlighted the need for clarification of the appeal rules, so that applicants understand: what outcomes can reasonably be expected.

It was agreed that these different kind of appeal outcomes should be formally defined in advance and discussed further during upcoming AMB meeting (19-20 march) and EU-level guidance will be sought.

### **3.2 Student Level Evaluation (Arrival) Test and Scholarships**

The meeting addressed the role and implications of the student level evaluation test conducted at the beginning of the programme.

#### **Key points :**

- The test is considered an important tool to assess whether students possess the necessary prerequisites, especially given their diverse academic backgrounds.
- Some students commit to acquiring missing prerequisites before arrival; however lack of sufficient preparation may lead to academic difficulties.

The test results are intended to be compared with first-semester academic performance to evaluate possible correlations.

Concerns were raised regarding the student agreement clause stating that failure in the preparation test could lead to scholarship withdrawal. It was agreed that:

- The purpose of the test is not to remove scholarships, but to ensure students are academically ready.
- The possibility of exclusion should relate to the programme itself, not directly to scholarship withdrawal.
- Clear rules must be established regarding the consequences of the test results.

### **3.3 Conditions for EMJM Scholarship withdrawal**

The meeting reviewed existing rules under which a student could lose an EMJM scholarship.

#### **Identified cases :**

##### **1. Attendance**

- Non-attendance of more than 10% of lectures without medical justification.
- Attendance monitoring practices differ between partner institutions.
- In some institutions, attendance is mandatory and monitored while in others, it is not mandatory.
- To date, this situation has not occurred.

##### **2. Academic Performance (ECTS Requirements)**

- Students are expected to validate at least 25 out of 30 ECTS in Semester 1.
- A total of 60 ECTS must be validated over the academic year.
- Semester 1 requirements of 30 ECTS are not met, but at least 25 ECTS are obtained compensation is possible in Semester 2.

- If the 25 ECTS requirements are not met, a last remediation pathway may be offered by the jury of Semester 1 after careful assessment of the student work, grades, commitment and motivation. This possible remediation includes exceptional resit exams in March while still continuing to Semester 2
- During this period, the scholarship is temporarily suspended and reinstated upon successful validation. Failing to the resit exams will lead to the exclusion of the students during Semester 2, independently of the results in Semester 2.

**The rule written in the present student agreement is considered as clear enough. The jury is sovereign to consider each specific cases and propose a remediation or not.**

### **3.4 Examination Scheduling**

The QAB raised concerns regarding overlapping examination dates, with some students facing up to three exams on the same day.

#### **Key points:**

- Complaints received by the Course Director were addressed promptly by adjusting schedules and no exams overlapped.
- The QAB reaffirmed that exam dates should be agreed upon jointly by teaching staff and students.
- • Scheduling challenges exist for courses with mixed cohorts from different tracks.
- • It was agreed that exam dates should be added earlier to academic agendas to allow for collective review and avoid conflicts, which is already the case.

### **3.5 Feedback from Teaching Staff**

The QAB recommended strengthening feedback mechanisms by:

- Requesting written feedback from teaching staff at the end of each semester.
- Discussing teaching-related issues during dedicated teaching staff meetings.
- Providing written summaries of these discussions to decision-making bodies (AMB and QAB).

### **3.6 Monitoring of Students' Learning Outcomes**

The QAB discussed the need for a structured and harmonised approach to monitoring learning outcomes.

#### **Agreed actions:**

- Course directors at each partner university must align their courses with defined Key and Specific Learning Outcomes.
- Administrative staff will compile grade data by course and learning outcome.
- The validation of the link between learning outcomes and courses is the responsibility of the AMB.

- A consolidated table linking courses, grades, and learning outcomes will be developed and maintained by the administrative staff.

### **3.7 Project-Specific KPIs Monitoring**

#### **Key points :**

- Project-specific (general) KPIs must be monitored by the administrative coordinator
- A KPI report should be provided to the QAB twice a year, ahead of QAB meetings.
- Next review of KPIs is scheduled for March.

### **3.8. Next Steps and Upcoming Meetings**

- AMB meeting scheduled in March, alongside parallel QAB meetings, followed by a joint session (19–20 March).
- The AMB will discuss whether the Partnership Agreement the Student Agreement and or the website must be changed or not to clarify the outcomes of the appeal procedure and level test at the start of the programme
- Definition of the learning outcomes-course alignment table by the Course Directors, validation by the AMB, completion by administrative staff.
- Data collection and report on the general KPI of the programme by the Administrative Coordinator by March 10.
- Collection of teaching staff feedback at the end of the semester by the Course Director.