European Doctorate for Health Promotion and Public Health

Scoping Study Report

Lisa Gugglberger

Centre for Health Research
University of Brighton

Team at the UoB
Caroline Hall
John Kenneth Davies

September, 2012

University of Brighton

Content

1. Introduction

For some time a loose network of partners from mainly European universities (and one outside of Europe) has been interested in establishing a joint doctorate within the fields of health promotion (HP) and public health (PH). The network was established on the basis of previous work around different curricular projects, like the development of the European Master for Health Promotion (EUMAHP) and the Public Health Education and Training in the Context of an Enlarging Europe (PHETICE 2008). As the development of a joint doctoral programme is a very complex process, a scoping study was conducted to provide an overview of possibilities and challenges within the field of European, collaborative, and joint doctorates. Results from this scoping study can be used as a basis for further discussions and decisions regarding the next steps of the process.

A joint (European) Doctorate is a degree, offered by a network of at least three European universities (European Commission 2011). Students of a European doctoral programme are registered at a home university but are required to accomplish some of their doctoral studies with at least two of the network universities, thereby gaining a broader understanding of their discipline. However, there are some alternatives to the very structured European doctorate.

Currently, there is no pan-European doctoral programme allowing students to experience the European Dimension of Health Promotion and Public Health. However, with developments arising from the Bologna Process, commitment by many European countries to trans-European education (EHEA 1999) and diverse processes of globalisation of higher education, it has become increasingly important for doctoral education to enhance its perspective across national borders (Higgs and Edwards 2002, Bryce 2004).

This scoping study was conducted in two steps: First, a literature review and analysis of existing European Doctorates and doctoral programmes in HP and PH was conducted. This part of the scoping study has already been finalised and has led to a first report by Jeffery and Elegbe (2011).

Second, to enhance the scoping study and provide more in-depth information, this second part was carried out. Its aim was to obtain a wider understanding of the complexity of developing and organising joint doctoral programmes and to identify recommendations, limitations and challenges for the next steps of the project. To examine this, a small scale qualitative study has been carried out, consisting of a (continued) literature study and qualitative interviews with nine stakeholders.

This report sets out the findings from the interviews and literature analysis, and presents recommendations for the development of a collaborative/joint doctorate. Throughout the report, references to the first report will be made.

The report is structured in five chapters. Following the introduction, in the second chapter some current trends in the fields of HP and PH as well as doctoral education will be described. The third chapter explains the methods used to generate and analyse the data for the qualitative study. Next, the results will be described: the benefits of developing a EuroDoc HPPH, the core learning outcomes the programme should have, the requirements the interviewees have identified, as well as crucial steps in the development of a European Doctorate. Finally, in the conclusion some recommendations for the next steps will be given.

2. Background

The potential development of a joint doctorate for HP and PH has to be seen within the wider context of current developments in the fields of HP and PH as well as doctoral education in Europe. The next chapters will therefore give a brief overview of these developments, and describe the current situation of doctorates and possibilities of internationalising doctorates.

2.1.Health as a Global Field

HP and PH are both interdisciplinary fields and both deal with global/ international issues and problems. HP and PH issues such as obesity (f.e. Chopra et al. 2002), ageing populations (f.e. King and King 2011), tobacco control (f.e. Collin 2012, Mackay 2012), HIV prevention (f.e. Narayan et al. 2011), prevention of alcohol / substance misuse (f.e. Coltart and Gilmore, 2012), etc. increasingly need global strategies and policies, global solutions and collaborative approaches. Furthermore, crises like the H1N1 pandemic have shown that global and multi-sectoral approaches are necessary to tackle disease prevention, pandemic control and health promotion (f.e. Liang et al. 2012). Health has become an issue that, alongside issues like security, economic growth, and human rights, has to be considered within global as well as national agendas (Ministers of Foreign Affairs 2011).

Therefore, issues of health, health care and prevention are tackled from a supra-national level and it can be expected that this trend will intensify and continue in the future. Health is no longer a national issue as it is no longer determined mainly by domestic conditions (Ministers of Foreign Affairs 2011).

Currently, there is no pan-European doctoral programme allowing students to experience the European Dimension of HP and PH and training future researchers and policy makers in these issues (Jeffery & Elegbe 2011). New and global approaches to policy, health care and research, however, create the need for better and internationally trained professionals – both in research and practice. As Labonté says, most health promoters have learned and honed their skills primarily at local level and are therefore not necessarily competent to engage in political processes of environmental protection, climate change, etc. (Labonté 2011). Training of researchers and practitioners in HP and PH therefore need to take on these new and wider issues. Furthermore, doctoral students of HP and PH are usually not sufficiently trained to work across sectors which is an issue that needs to be approached (Neuhauser et al. 2007).

2.2.European Developments

There are two important political and educational developments in Europe that have had an impact on doctoral education: the Bologna Declaration of 1999, which created the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the Lisbon Strategy of 2000, which created the European Research and Innovation Area (ERIA) (EHEA 1999, Lisbon European Council 2000, Kehm 2007).

The **Bologna Process** was launched after an initial meeting in Sorbonne in 1998 (Sorbonne Communiqué 1998) at a meeting in Bologna in 1999 by the Ministers of Education and university leaders of 29 countries. It aimed to create a European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010. The main objectives were to promote mobility, international competitiveness, and employability, as well as to connect the national educational

systems (as opposed to harmonising them). Meanwhile, 46 countries within and outside the European Union are involved. Participation in the Bologna Process is voluntary.

The EHEA set out to improve transparency between national higher education systems and to develop tools that facilitate the recognition of degrees and academic qualifications. "The Bologna process aims at creating convergence and, thus, is not a path towards the "standardisation" or "uniformisation" of European higher education. The fundamental principles of autonomy and diversity are respected" (EHEA 1999).

All participating countries have agreed on a **two cycle degree system** – undergraduate and graduate:

- 1st cycle: Bachelor – usually 180-240 ECTS[1]
- 2nd cycle: Master – usually 90-120 ECTS

In 2000 the **Lisbon Strategy** was launched, creating the European Research and Innovation Area (ERIA). Among its aims was "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world", and to increase mobility of researchers "to attract and retain high-quality research talent in Europe" (Lisbon European Council 2000).

Following this, in 2003 the Berlin Communiqué added a third cycle – the doctorate. The Communiqué underlines the role of doctoral programmes and research training, saying: "European Higher Education Area and European Research Area – two pillars of the knowledge based society".

- 3rd cycle: Doctorate – no ECTS range given[2]

The reform of the first two cycles (Bachelor and Master degree) is well underway in the participating countries. The transformation of doctoral education on the other hand, has not come far yet (Kersten et al. 2010).

After the meeting in Berlin, there are now altogether ten action lines that have been formulated by the Bologna (1999), Prague (2001) and Berlin (2003) meetings:

Table 1: ten action lines of the Bologna process

Established in the Bologna Declaration of 1999	1.	Adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees
	2.	Adoption of a system essentially based on two cycles
	3.	Establishment of a system of credits
	4.	Promotion of mobility
	5.	Promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance
	6.	Promotion of the European dimension in higher education
Added after the Prague Ministerial Conference of 2001	7.	Focus on lifelong learning
	8.	Greater inclusion of higher education institutions and students in the Bologna Process
	9.	Promotion of the attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area

[1] ECTS – the European Credit Transfer System – is used as part of the Bologna process as a tool for the description of courses and degrees, to promote student mobility (EHEA 1999).

[2] In a survey in 2004 about 20% of European countries used the ECTS system for the doctoral level (Tauch 2004). Usually the degree is 180 ECTS.

Added after the Berlin Ministerial Conference of 2003	10. Doctoral studies and the synergy between the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area

Furthermore, of importance to the doctoral education in Europe, the Bergen meeting in 2005 has issued a Communiqué which addresses the needs and changes for doctoral education:

> "With a view to achieving better results we recognise the need to improve the synergy between the higher education sector and other research sectors throughout our respective countries and between the EHEA and the European Research Area. To achieve these objectives, doctoral level qualifications need to be fully aligned with the EHEA overarching framework for qualifications using the outcomes-based approach. The core component of doctoral training is the advancement of knowledge through original research. Considering the **need for structured doctoral programmes** and the **need for transparent supervision and assessment**, we note that the normal workload of the third cycle in most countries would correspond to 3-4 years full time. We urge universities to ensure that their doctoral programmes promote **interdisciplinary training and the development of transferable skills**, thus meeting the needs of the wider employment market. We need to achieve an overall **increase in the numbers of doctoral candidates** taking up research careers within the EHEA." (Bergen Communiqué 2005: 3-4; highlights not in the original file)

Caused by these European developments, realities of doctorates and doctoral programmes have started to change in the last decades. It is noted that processes of globalisation change the context and substance of doctoral education and that a shift from national policy making to the supra-national level can be observed, as European initiatives influence national agendas more and more (Kehm 2007). It is therefore becoming increasingly important for doctoral education to enhance its perspective across national borders (Higgs and Edwards 2002, Bryce 2004). Furthermore, international collaboration in scientific education and training is increasingly important and fostered by these developments. Academic research is in a process of internationalisation due to growing mobility of academics and doctoral students (Vincent-Lancrin 2006).

De Rosa (2008) says that these processes of European political integration and globalisation have created a need for a new generation of researchers and policy makers who are able to work within different cultural settings and adopt a transnational perspective (de Rosa 2008: 3, Delgado et al. 2010). The generation of new knowledge has become an economic factor and a strategic resource in a globally competitive Europe (Kehm 2007). North America, Japan and some developing countries are seen as primary competition (Bryce et al. 2004).

At the same time, growing competition in the labour market and changes in doctoral programmes have resulted in the fact, that there is an increase in doctoral students in Europe (Kehm 2007). This means that the aims and purposes of doctoral degrees are changing – not only students that are interested in an academic career decide to do a doctorate, but also ones that seek better qualification on the non-adademic labour markets. For this reason, as is also highlighted in the quote of the Bergen Communiqué above, the need for more structured doctoral education in Europe has been expressed repeatedly (Tauch 2004, Bergen Communiqué 2005).

Yet another recent development is that universities are put under pressure to increase their quality as they have to compete with each other to recruit students (to receive fees and/or government funding) and secure funding (Higgs and Edwards 2002, EUA 2007). Universities are now more than ever judged in terms of their output (graduates, degrees offered, research) (Higgs and Edwards 2002).

2.3.Diversity of University Structures

A further reality in the area of doctoral education is the current status of doctorates and doctoral programmes in Europe, which can be described as a very heterogeneous and diverse field (Bryce et al. 2004, EUA 2007, Önnerfors 2007). There are over a thousand universities that can award doctorates in Europe (while there are only about 400 in the USA) (Kersten et al. 2010).

Different European countries have different forms of doctorates, different labels/ names for doctorates, different understandings what a doctorate implies and different traditions and cultures of writing and supervising doctoral theses. Furthermore, national and institutional structures vary widely, making them very hard to compare (Tauch 2004). This is further complicated by the fact that there are no parameters or analytical tools to compare the state of the art of post-graduate training (Önnerfors 2007). In some countries doctoral programmes are set up nationally, in other countries, however, doctoral programmes are under the university's responsibility or federal laws (Önnersfors 2007, EUA 2007, Kersten et al. 2010). Furthermore, while some countries have regulated the evaluation of doctoral training and universities, quality assessment is not yet the standard (Kehm 2004, Önnersfors 2007).

A problem resulting from this diversity is that free circulation of scientists and doctoral students in the EU is restricted, due to differences in degrees, cultures and languages and that establishing harmonisation and comparability are both extremely complicated tasks (f.e. Bryce et al. 2004).

Training at doctoral level is usually about skills needed to carry out research, to disseminate research, acquire teaching skills (to teach at university level) or acquire skills for the labour market outside academia (Önnerfors 2007). Generally, there are two different forms of doctorate that currently exist in Europe that can be described as two basic types of organising the doctoral phase:

1) the "master-apprentice" model (Tauch 2004), which is the traditional model in continental Europe, where doctoral students have few courses, often solely communicate with their supervisor and are organised with a high degree of "laissez-faire" (Kehm 2007, Kersten et al. 2010);
2) the (newer) doctoral programmes, that have a clearer structure and taught courses, where students are often grouped into doctoral schools (Kersten et al. 2010). The criteria – such as duration, number of modules/courses needed, and theses – varies greatly across countries, as well as within countries (f.e. Kertsten et al. 2010).

The second model will become increasingly more important, as European trends described above continue (Tauch 2004, Kehm 2007, EUA 2007). However, this development can also be interpreted as a threat to academic freedom, originality and credibility (Önnerfors 2007).

Besides the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD or DPhil) – which is the most common doctorate in most countries in Europe – new alternative forms of doctorates have emerged in the last decades: The Professional doctorate (EUA 2007, Taylor 2008, Park 2005) is a doctorate that only exists in the UK and aims at combining instructional work with a research project or projects within a structured programme. It is often attractive

for professionals because of its structure and the combination of ongoing work commitments with research (Taylor 2008). Some doctoral programmes in continental Europe now accept students with a Bachelor degree, a common form in the USA (Kehm 2007), called fast-track programmes.

Style and culture of supervision is very diverse across Europe – independent of more traditional doctorates or doctoral programmes (Kersten et al. 2010). Qualification of supervisors, structure and organisation of the supervision, the relationship between students and their supervisor(s), etc. all depend on the norms and traditions of the universities and/or countries.

As already mentioned, the different doctorates and doctoral programmes accept very different forms of theses. The typical length and structure vary, and the traditional monograph is increasingly being replaced by a PhD by publication, i.e. a PhD that (partly) consists of peer-reviewed journal articles. In some countries it is even obligatory to publish (parts of) the thesis (Kersten et al. 2010).

A further major difference in doctorates in Europe is the status and perception of the students, or rather the definition of the status people have that are doing a PhD – ranging from PhD students that have to pay a tuition fee (which is rather high in the UK and considerably lower in other countries); and students that get paid for the post of doctoral student (as is the case in Scandinavian countries) (Kehm 2004, 2007, Önnersfors 2007). There are also great differences in the social conditions of PhD students, not only concerning wages, but access to social security, parental leave and unemployment compensation, as well as in the recruitment and selection of PhD students (Önnersfors 2007). Furthermore, in some countries teaching is obligatory for doctoral students, while in other is it not (Kersten et al. 2010).

There is awareness that the different forms of degree structures and definitions of doctorates are obstacles to international cooperation, leading to changes in some countries (Önnerfors 2007). Development of new joint doctorates is often seen as a possible – yet very difficult – solution to homogenise and harmonise doctoral education and to overcome out-dated and isolated doctorates, as well as to increase the quality of doctoral programmes (de Rosa 2008). However, the design and delivery of international doctorates need a different logic to the one of national programmes, especially regarding legal, institutional, administrative and informally-established procedures (Delgado et al. 2010).

2.4.Different Models for a Collaborative or Joint Doctorate

By analysing the structures of some existing European Doctorates, Jefferey and Elegbe (2011) have identified two distinct ways of establishing international degrees – 1) national programmes that offer a supplementary qualification ratified by a collaborative network, and 2) jointly developed and jointly accredited doctoral programmes.

De Rosa (2010) makes a similar distinction to the one above, speaking of “internationalisation at home”, dual-degree programmes, “collaborative internationalised Doctorates” and “joint international/European Doctorates”. All these models have the aim of internationalising doctorates (de Rosa 2008).

1. “Internationalisation at home”

“Internationalisation at home” implies the increased recruitment of international students and staff, however, there is no need to collaborate with another university. This type of doctoral programme may include an international dimension in the courses and is typically taught in English.

2. Dual-degree programmes:

There are several forms of dual degree programmes, i.e. a student graduates with diplomas from two educational institutions — sometimes in two countries. A benefit of such dual-degree programmes is that they are very cost efficient to establish and do not require the development of joint courses or joint regulations. However, they are always only based on individual, personalised agreements. De Rosa (2010) says that this model can be adopted for internationalising existing traditional doctorates or as a first step towards collaborative doctoral programmes. It is easier to adopt than a joint doctoral programme, especially if working conditions and legal frameworks to develop and deliver mutually recognised joint doctorates do not exist (de Rosa 2010).

The most common form of dual degrees is the Co-tutelle: The Cotutelle-Model derives from a French initiative aimed at supporting bi-national supervision of doctoral students between French universities and universities from other countries. In the meantime the Cotutelle-model has been established as one of the most common models of international supervision, no longer restricted to France only.

Cotutelle agreements are personalised agreements concerning the supervision of individual students and are made between a home and a partner university. Students defend their PhDs at the home universities. For the time of study the student is registered at both universities. The individual agreement defines how tuition fees are handled (see for example the policy of the University of Ottawa (2008), or the University of Vienna (not dated)).

The supplement "Doctor Europeus" (lat.) is a specific form of a co-tutelle that was formalised in 1993 (de Rosa 2008). It can be awarded if a set of conditions apply:

1. The candidate must spend at least three months at a university in another European country,
2. Part of the thesis has to be written in a European language other than the official language of the home institution,
3. The thesis has to be supervised by two professors from two different institutions in two countries,
4. The dissertation jury must include at least one member from a European country, different from the home institution.

De Rosa (2010) describes that this supplement, together with the established requirements, have been a milestone in the process of internationalisation of doctorates in Europe, and are a fundamental step towards collaborative doctoral programmes (de Rosa 2010: 222).

3. Collaborative Internationalised Doctoral Programmes

These doctorates have some internationalisation based on bilateral or inter-institutional agreements regarding mobility of students and teachers, co-tutoring, shared policies for the thesis and award etc. In this case, the doctoral programme is not developed by several universities, but by a single university; doctoral students are enrolled de-centrally at one institution. Collaborative doctorates are very similar to dual-degree agreements, with the addition that a supplement to the doctoral degree is awarded either jointly or by the home institution (de Rosa 2010).

4. Joint European/International Doctorate

Joint doctorates are doctoral programmes that have been established and are delivered by a network of (European) universities. It is therefore a jointly established multilateral programme (de Rosa 2008). They require a high level of integration, need joint procedures for recruitment, supervision and teaching of

students, have a centralised enrolment and tuition fees. Erasmus Mundus[3] is one specific form and funding body for Joint European Doctorates that dictates very specific terms. There are several joint doctorates that are not funded by Erasmus and therefore have other criteria (see f.e. Forbes and Lehr 2005). Further possibilities for funding can be seen in Appendix II.

De Rosa (2008) summarises a set of "musts" for a joint European Doctorate that is in line with the Erasmus mundus criteria (European Commission 2011):

- Network build up of either a bottom up or top-down network consisting of at least three European countries (see also European Commission 2011). This network has to be able to deal with potential crises, such as internal conflicts, changes in leadership, loss of partners, etc.
- Joint criteria concerning the whole process of planning, implementing and monitoring: this includes the selection of students, format for the thesis, language policy, development of courses, etc. (see also European Commission 2011).
- Structure: first, international and multi supervision as well as co-tutoring needs to be well planned and structured, as students should be in contact with supervisors in each country they study in. Second, mobility of researchers and students needs to be planned and structured – students need to spend at least 12 months – six months each in at least two partner-countries (see also European Commission 2011). Furthermore, de Rosa (2008) says that collective mobility needs to be planned, as summer schools and conferences need to bring students and researchers together. Third, a credit accumulation system needs to be put in place – de Rosa (2008) states that ECTS is a must for the transferability of credits. Finally, the thesis, or part of the thesis needs o be written in another language than the country of the home university. The European Commission (for Erasmus mundus funding) does not include this as a 'must', however, say that the use of at least two European languages spoken in the countries of the partner-universities must be provided for.
- Infrastructure: physical and virtual infrastructure (facilities at the coordinating university and at the partner-universities; a web site, etc.) must be installed.
- Management: this includes defining transparent codes of conduct for students and teachers, the network management, administration, as well as a common tuition fee structure. While de Rosa (2008) acknowledges that the adoption of a common fee structure and centralised administration is extremely complex, she sees it as a benefit, as it creates equal conditions for students. The European Commission (2011) does not mandate the establishment of tuition fees, however, emphasizes the need for a common and transparent decision of all partners.

Within this scoping report the focus will be put on the Joint (European) Doctorate (i.e. that is jointly developed and run by a network of partner institutions); however, many of the recommendations, requirements and benefits also apply to the alternative models.

[3] Erasmus Mundus will probably not be continued after 2013, as it will be incorporated in "Erasmus for all" (see Appendix II). As no new information about the funding for joint degrees is available from the European Commission, the Programme Guide from 2011 will be used as a reference in this report (European Commission 2011).

3. Methods

In order to obtain a wider understanding of the complexity of developing and organising joint doctoral programmes and to identify recommendations, limitations, and challenges for the next steps of the project, a small scale qualitative study was conducted.

Nine interviews with ten stakeholders were carried out (see table 2; one interview was conducted with two participants) and two written replies to the interview questions were collected. Recruitment of participants was not easy – a total of 37 people were contacted to reach the aspired number of 8-10 interviews. Professors and lecturers of HP and PH (or similar fields), PhD students of HP or PH, as well as Coordinators and partners of already existing joint/European doctorates were addressed.

Participants were identified 1) within the group that has previously expressed interest in a European doctorate for HP and PH (i.e. the network of interested partners), 2) through recommendations of these interested partners and 3) through Internet search. The first group was given the choice of doing a (telephone) interview or of giving written replies to the interview questions (to save resources), the second and third group were given the possibility to see the interview questions before the interview if they wished.

Table 2 gives an overview of the stakeholders interviewed and their current countries of work/study.

Table 2: Overview of qualitative data

	Job title/ description	**Country**
Interviews (n=10)	Co-ordinator of an international PH Doctorate	Finland
	Co-ordinator of a European Doctorate together with vice president for international relations	France
	Partner in a European Doctorate	UK
	Student of a joint PH Doctorate	Finland
	Lecturer of PH	Greece
	Lecturer of HP	Norway
	Prof. of HP and PH	Ireland
	Prof. of Health Psychology	Belgium
	Prof. of Health Education	Finland
Written replies (n=2)	Lecturer and researcher in Health Psychology	Belgium
	Prof. of Community Health	Spain

All interviews were recorded with the participants' permission and transcribed verbatim. Interviews lasted between 20 and 55 minutes and were conducted between the end of May and the beginning of August 2012.

The interview guide was semi-structured, consisting of four different parts (see Appendix I). The first set of questions concerned the content and importance of a European Doctorate for HP and PH; the second part dealt with the development of European Doctorates in general. During the third part, interviewees were asked about benefits and limitations of European Doctorate programmes; the fourth set of questions focused on the implementation and practicalities of a European Doctorate. There were slight variations in the interview schedule, depending on the participants' expertise in the fields of HP and PH, and the development of joint/ collaborative doctorates.

The data was analysed with the help of the software Nvivo. A thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006) was carried out in different steps: the transcripts were read by the primary researcher and a set of codes was developed through deductive (following theoretical considerations and interview questions) and inductive (identifying additional themes brought up by the interviewees) coding. This set of codes (or “nodes”, as they are called in Nvivo) was applied to all data. Lastly, the codes were structured, compared and organised into themes.

4. Results

4.1.Benefits and Limitations of a EuroDoc HPPH

4.1.1. General Benefits of a EuroDoc HPPH

Most interviewees said that the establishment of a European Doctorate for HP and PH was important and a good idea and expressed an interest in the programme. The primary benefit that interviewees saw was that it gives visibility to the field of HP and PH and may help to create a critical mass. The field of HP and PH could be improved through a European Doctorate, because more students would be trained in this area:

> *"I think there are benefits to health promotion in Europe around having people trained and qualified at that level with the kind of clear perspective around what is health promotion research. We need people qualified at that high level – you know – in order to move forward on the research agenda, and so I think they – and there are benefits as well, I think, to the academic community*" (Professor).

The globalisation of the fields of HP and PH was also mentioned as a reason for needing a European doctorate: "*Health issues are not local any more, they are more or less global*" (Student).

Similarly, another interviewee says:

> *"Because we are internationalising in all sites and communities, universities must have much more international co-operation than earlier and also the health promotion challenges are more global and shared […] I think the arguments are the same as in any academic international programme but maybe the specific argument for a health promotion doctoral programme is really – in my opinion – this that these health problems are shared and we need much more cultural understanding to try to solve global and domestic health challenges"* (Professor).

A European Doctorate in HP and PH would furthermore lead to uniform standards: "*So everybody will know what we're talking about when they present us with a European doctorate degree*" (Lecturer) Interviewees often stressed the need for *harmonisation*, *comparability* and *unification* of the curriculum – so "*it would level the field*" (Professor).

Another one says:

> *"Having a common sort of European doctorate would be leading towards some kind of harmonisation of the doctoral standards of health promotion around Europe and I think that would be hugely beneficial"* (Professor).

Additionally, a benefit is that in an international doctorate, many international experts would contribute to the teaching and thereby potentially improve the quality of the programme.

4.1.2. Benefits for Students

For students first and foremost the experience and opportunity of spending time in another country was identified as a benefit. It was described as a *unique possibility* to learn about other cultures, to see how other countries deal with specific issues, to broaden their understanding and to "*open their eyes*" (Professor).

> *"The opportunity to go and do work in another country – in another institution – that's the biggest benefit they get*" (EuroDoc Partner).

Second, academic benefits were named, like "*supervision by the crème-de-la-crème*" (Professor), the possibility to choose from more courses that meet their interests and the possibility to learn about different perspectives by different academics in other countries.

> *"It is also the only possibility to learn in an authentic way, for example, in which way health promotion has been organised in different countries"* (Professor).

Finally, network and career opportunities were seen as benefits for students – students would be able to not only collaborate with other teachers and students during their studies but might even find post-doc opportunities through the network.

> *"If PhD students are researchers, it's very important to have international connections and knowledge on collaborating with people from other countries. It's much easier through this kind of network compared to a situation where the students have to find contacts themselves"* (Student).

4.1.3. Benefits for Researchers and Universities

Benefits for universities and researchers are, first, the possibility to network and collaborate with academics in different countries working in a similar field. This can help institutions not only to broaden their expertise and share projects, but also to share best practices of doctoral training and teaching.

Second, the mobility of researchers could be supported through a European Doctorate, as staff would be supported to teach at other universities, and attend international summer schools and conferences.

Third, university structures might be adapted and improved by learning from other countries, as good-practice is shared:

> "*A full programme at the European level will more or less oblige the universities to change a few of their procedures that may not be working properly at the national level*" (Lecturer).

Finally, the quality of the programme itself can be a benefit for the university. It can attract very good doctoral students who contribute to the research of the institutes and can help teachers to develop their teaching skills (and English skills). A well-established international doctoral programme can improve the universities' standing and reputation.

> *"Another benefit is I think the image – I think all the university departments want to be very international and it's not enough if you publish internationally but your corridors must be full of international students before you can really call your faculty or institution international"* (Professor).

This can in turn have an impact on funding possibilities, as one interviewee mentions:

"In Finland our funding is partly dependent on the fact how much and what kind of international education we offer for students. […] So internationalisation is one of the positive indicators if you succeed to give evidence you really have created these kind of programmes" (Professor).

4.1.4. Limitations and Alternatives

Some problems and limitations were identified by the interviewees: First, the fear was expressed, that individuality may get lost, as all institutions involved in the EuroDoc would need to do similar things.

Second, in the contrary, the problem was described, that the European dimension might not work, if people and institutions continue to focus mostly on their home country.

Furthermore, as a big problem, a number of administrative issues were addressed by the interviewees (e.g. funding, tuition fees, administration of the programme), which will be discussed in a later chapter.

Finally, the existing heterogeneous structures of legislations and university structures, as well as different understandings and traditions in the fields of health promotion and public health were identified as problematic issues for a European Doctorate.

"There are so many different systems within Europe – what is a PhD? How do you run the PhD? And I suppose that Turkey is very different from Norway or Italy or whatever" (Lecturer).

Interviewees spoke of different cultures and norms, in terms of degrees, theses, tuition fees, etc.

"It is difficult to pin down but it's very important to be clear at the outset as to what constitutes a PhD. And that differs, we found, from country to country" (EuroDoc Partner).

Some interviewees have suggested alternative models, either because the European Doctorate may not be feasible or because it might be too much effort as a first step. A coordinator of a European Doctorate explained that a Euro Doc is not always the best solution:

"For us, we decided because in this area it is more realistic to work with a dual degree at the beginning. […] After that it's possible to reflect about a joint degree that links the concession. But this is complicated to put in place and not always the best way to make the – I think – the degree valuable" (Coordinator EuroDoc).

Alternative models mentioned were dual degrees, i.e. individual agreements between two universities to supervise a student, like the Cotutelle (see chapter 2.4). A problem with these is that they are always only bi-lateral. Another alternative that was suggested by some interviewees was to establish a pool or database of courses for all HP and PH PhD students:

"I think that it would rather – it would be more practical to somehow make some guidelines, make some kind of a pool of courses relevant for students wanting to do their PhD within health promotion and then they could go to take these courses and that might be in different places in Europe" (Lecturer).

"I'm not sure if there is such a big demand to have a degree – joint degree. I think that there's more demand for joint courses and seminars and doctoral training as such" (Coordinator EuroDoc).

4.2.Core Learning Outcomes of a EuroDoc HPPH

The question, what the core learning outcomes of a EuroDoc HPPH should be was – unsurprisingly – difficult to answer for the interviewees.

> *"I think that's a difficult question to answer just like that. If you want a list of outcomes, I think I can't just fabricate that off the top of my head. I would like to refer to the CompHP Competencies and also to the competencies definded by ASPHER, the Association of Public Health in the European region. There of course the outcomes have been defined for the Master level but I would like to look at them specifically and build on them to see to what extent this can be extended more at a doctoral level"* (Professor).

Interviewees describe two sets of knowledge and skills they think European Doctorates need to acquire: First, core learning outcomes should be around HP and PH theory and knowledge – i.e. about policies, knowledge about different countries, etc. Doctoral students should reach a shared understanding what HP and PH is.

Second, core learning outcomes need to centre on methodology and research skills, i.e. qualitative as well as quantitative methods and experience towards the context of research in European countries.

> *"I think if it's a doctorate, it needs to look at high level research skills in health promotion. I mean, clearly, it's a doctoral research and to look at the particular suite of skills and knowledge in research that's needed for health promotion"* (Professor).

One professor says that on top of the normal outcomes of doctoral programmes (to learn about methodology, research process and how to write a thesis), there should be specific outcomes for the European Doctorate:

> *"I think in a European doctorate programme for health promotion, it is also important to gain more understanding of culture specific and context specific methodologies"* (Professor).

Jeffery and Elegbe (2011) have proposed some subject areas that could potentially be addresses by HP and PH training (see Jeffery and Elegbe 2011: 9). Furthermore, works of the IUHPE (1999), the ASPHER (Association of Schools of Public Health in the European Region) and the CompHP Project (Competences in Health Promotion – see Speller et al. 2012, Dempsey et al. 2011) provide important background for the development of the content of a European doctorate for HP and PH.

4.3. Requirements for a European Doctorate

Before a European Doctorate can be developed, some basic requirements and resources need to be in place. These requirements primarily concern the individuals and universities needed for the development of a joint doctorate, as will be described in the next chapters.

4.3.1. Partnership

First, a strong partnership of committed people and institutions is a requirement to establish a joint degree. This is something that is frequently mentioned by interviewees and within the literature. First of all it is important to establish a network of people that are committed to the cause:

"There's lots of less formal requirements in terms of relationships between institutions and often between individuals that are very important and you have to have people who are committed, a group of people committed to making the thing work" (EuroDoc Partner).

A problem with any partnership and long-term cooperation is to make it sustainable and to have stability in the partnership, as one interviewee says:

"It helps to have some stability in the institution in the persons at the institutions that are involved. [...] If institutions continually are changing their representative, that makes life difficult because you never know who you're going to see from that institution at next year's annual seminar or the scientific committee meeting" (EuroDoc Partner).

A recommendation by some interviewees is therefore to build a network of partners that have worked together previously, that have built a relationship and that also know what the different institutions are about. Within the partnership it is important to "*respect the identity of each institution*" (Professor), as well as to pay attention to: "*various cultures and ways to work and personalities and you have to find a good balance between the individualities*" (Coordinator EuroDoc).

Furthermore, the coordinating body needs to organise and facilitate collaboration, and develop indicators for good collaboration. An interviewee explains that long-term collaboration can only work, if a "*very clear structure and clear agreements*" (Lecturer) are established.

When establishing the partnership, a coordinator of a European Doctorate says that it is important to include non-academic partners, i.e. partners from industry, health care etc.

4.3.2. Shared Vision

Second, a requirement that goes hand in hand with the partnership is a shared vision between the partners:

"*I think you need to have some kind of vision as to what the doctorate is about and the kinds of research that the students are going to do. So that's the first thing: there needs to be some kind of unifying theme in the work – and this could be a subject specific theme or it could be a methodological theme or it could be interdisciplinary*" (EuroDoc Partner).

The shared vision is not only important for any future work between the partners, but is also a requirement to write a successful bid to get funding. An interviewee suggests that the aim or vision of the EuroDoc HPPH collaboration should be "*to develop health promotion as a discipline in Europe and to help environments in different countries to develop*" (Lecturer).

An important observation was made in the interviews: most interviewees were either from a PH or from a HP background, therefore no one spoke about HPPH as a common field, but rather focused on either HP or PH.

Few interviewees expressed their opinion about the focus of the doctorate, like this one:

"I think that a European PhD in this area should be in health promotion and not health promotion and public health, and that is to somehow distinguish it from the public health tradition and rather focus on... According to my opinion, health promotion was somehow created in opposition to the traditional public health research tradition. And therefore I think it should be a doctoral programme for health promotion" (Lecturer)

Another interviewee noted similarly, that the distinction between HP and PH is not clear and needs to be clarified:

> *"A challenge I think is the distinction between health promotion and public health, which at the principal and theoretical level is very clear but in practice is not always clear. You see that there is overlap, if not sometimes a little competition and on the one hand sometimes tendency to really assert oneself as health promotion separately and [on the other] as part of the public health. There is probably more the idea that it's incorporated, so I think it needs to be resolved"* (Professor).

Therefore, a decision has to be made very early on whether there should be a focus on HP, on PH, or on how these two can be integrated into a core understanding.

4.3.3. Coordination

The coordinator of European Doctorates has a crucial role in establishing the network of partners, coordinating the development of the programme and finally coordinating the continuous realisation and improvement of the programme. An interviewee who is a partner in a European Doctorate acknowledges the amounts of work that goes into the coordination of the programme:

> *"Most of the work was done by our colleagues in X. […] I guess there was an awful lot of background work done by people in X, who was the co-ordinating institution, in terms of liaising with different other institutions and just preparing papers, meetings and so forth "* (EuroDoc Partner).

Coordination, furthermore, needs to be in charge of monitoring the process:

> *"The programme should be very well co-ordinated and monitored accordingly so that we all know what we're doing and – you know – in terms of time and quality and amount of work"* (Lecturer).

The coordinating body/person, therefore, needs to be very committed to the project:

> *"You need someone too that is dedicated to being able to – how can I say? – really be the co-ordinator of the project"* (Coordinator EuroDoc).

4.3.4. Support and Commitment of the Universities

Support and commitment from the universities is crucial for the development and for the continuous existence of the programme.

> "*One requirement is of course that the leadership of the faculties, institutions and universities – they really support it. Leaders must become committed in the very early phase*" (Professor).

University leaders have to be committed for the long term and they have to be willing to support the programme financially, as European and national funds are often not sufficient. The financial commitment does not have to be huge, says one of the interviewees, but f.e. universities may have to pay for the staff to travel.

An interviewee says that it needs willingness at the institutional level to "*overcome internal bureaucracy to enable this to happen*" (Professor).

4.3.5. Time and Experience

Two further requirements that were described by interviewees are time and experience of the collaborating partners.

Time is important as the partnership work as well as the actual work concerning the programme can be very time consuming.

> *"I think that for us one of the great obstacles is* […] *that this often comes on top of the rest – all these people are (occupied) by their job, by their research, by their teaching and they also at this level have international or local, even political responsibilities and so I'm not sure that this kind of international dimension always receives the full recognition that it deserves"* (Coordinator EuroDoc).

> *"It's quite hard work and it takes a lot of time.* […]*The bureaucratic processes is also quite long lasting and we need time and energy for that kind of things"* (Professor).

In addition to staff time, experience with joint and/or international programmes and high academic qualifications of the staff are necessary to develop such a complex programme. It needs to be assured that all partner institutes have staff experienced with international supervision of students and high qualifications in the fields of HP and PH.

> *"Of course you need qualified staff – you need qualified supervisors and so on"* (Professor).

> *"I guess the qualifications of the supervisors should be above a certain level in terms of experience, and you know research interests and research performance in general"* (Lecturer).

Furthermore, administrative staff and technical support need to be available to make sure administrative processes run smoothly – in the coordinating centre and in the participating universities.

4.4.Development of a EuroDoc HPPH

While the previous chapter concerns requirements that already need to be in place when starting with the development of a joint doctorate, this chapter deals with important steps and decisions that need to be made to develop the programme.

4.4.1. Securing of Funding

To secure some sort of funding is a very important step – if not a requirement – in the process of developing a joint doctorate.

> *"Finance is a constant challenge but I wouldn't say it's the biggest one – we always seem to work out money"* (EuroDoc Partner)

Appendix II shows a list of identified funding streams that could be used for the development of a joint doctoral programme. Overall, the interviewees did not know of many funding streams available specifically for the development of (joint) programmes. The most common one mentioned is Erasmus Mundus (see Chapter 2.4.), followed by Marie Curie funds (International Training Network) and some (rather imprecise) references to European funds and the Framework programme. Interviewees also speak of different national

funds that could be accessed – for instance from the national ministries of education, national grants for students, etc. – as well as the need for the participating universities to make some financial commitments.

A coordinator of a European Doctorate says that in his/her opinion, Erasmus mundus is the only funding body for a joint European Doctorate. It has the clear benefit that it is a well-known label, has a very clear and transparent structure and makes the programme visible and attractive within and outside of Europe. Furthermore, it includes a number of scholarships for students.

> *"In case Erasmus mundus would not have been accepted, I think we would have worked at our level without the funds from Europe to create this doctorate in all cases but it would be very, very complicated"* (Coordinator EuroDoc)

However, another coordinator of a European Doctorate explains that their EuroDoc is not funded by Erasmus mundus at all, but primarily by the Italian ministry for Education, as well as other funding bodies. Most interviewees think that there needs to be a combination of different funding streams – Erasmus, national funds, grants for students, etc. – to develop and deliver the programme. Different streams for mobility and travel of staff and students can be used, as well as streams that support networking and collaboration of researchers. Furthermore, some interviewees have mentioned the possibility to collaborate with industrial partners:

> *"Of course, there might be some innovative way to get sponsors or sponsorship but in my knowledge, the resource variety is not too big"* (Professor)

4.4.2. Agreements and Definitions

In order to establish a joint doctoral programme, several legal and structural factors have to be considered and agreements have to be reached. First, the network of partners needs a well-defined, transparent, and solid agreement that all participating institutes can agree upon and can work with. This agreement needs a common understanding of what the programme should be, what the requirements for the students and staff are, how the programme will be delivered, how students will be supervised, how institutes will collaborate etc. Thus, one of the first steps of developing a European Doctorate is to achieve "*formalisation of this process* [the development of a European Doctorate] *through agreements between the universities"* (Coordinator EuroDoc).

As there is likely a huge diversity of structures, requirements and legal frameworks of the participating institutions, this is a very complex process. An interviewee, who is part of a European Doctorate, recalls that this phase of defining the programme was very challenging:

> *"We had to find ways of accommodating the different structures of higher education and we had to learn from one another, I mean we had to sit down with six or seven different countries who were there then and there was a learning experience in which we all explained how higher education worked in our country and that was something we had to do at an early stage before any students were actually admitted to the programme. That was a challenge"* (EuroDoc Partner).

Second, clear indicators have to be defined so the performance of students, staff and the programme can be assessed and compared.

"Different standards apply – different environments, especially in education. So there should be a uniform decision on what the indicators should be – let's say, time wise, the number of subjects taught, or the publications – that needs to be decided upon" (Lecturer)

Third, an agreement has to be reached regarding the recruitment of students – i.e. the qualification criteria/entrance requirements of students, whether students are registered centrally (a requirement for Erasmus mundus) or not – as well as tuition fees and the formal status of the students. Again, in the different European countries, there are diverse regulations regarding tuition fees – some countries have no tuition fees for PhD students at all (f.e. Finland, Norway, Greece), other countries have very high fees (f.e. UK). Furthermore, some countries employ their doctoral students and pay a salary, while others have specific national grants for PhD students.

"The tuition fees issue is a problem – can be a problem. Ideally you should try and get that sorted out at the beginning. Either some kind of tuition fee waiver or some kind of deal. I don't have any recommendations as to what the deal should be, because you might find you can use scholarships or some money – there are differences. There's not a lot you can do to – you can't remove those differences but you do need to try and find some way of accommodating that" (EuroDoc Partner)

Most interviewees express the opinion that there should be equality for all students within the doctoral programme, therefore a common solution has to be found whether or not tuition fees are put in place and how high they should be.

"It's not fair if they are studying a joint programme and others have to pay fees and others don't" (Coordinator international doctorate).

Alternative suggestions to establishing a common tuition fee for all institutions were on the one hand, to split the fees proportionately, depending on the universities the individual students study at or, on the other hand, to pay fees according to the national regulations.

The coordinator of a European Doctorate points out that there is a specific problem with the UK because tuition fees in the UK are higher than the funding Erasmus mundus provides. In their case, the participating British university had to agree to the lower tuition fees – it was "*a critical problem with the UK*" (Coordinator EuroDoc).

All interviewees agree that reaching these agreements and establishing a common structure and common requirements and procedures are among the biggest challenges of developing a joint doctorate. There is no easy guideline or recommendation, how to establish this agreement – an interviewee says:

"It's not an easy road – this is not some kind of thing which will fall into place without quite a lot of commitment and hard work and some tension on the way" (EuroDoc Partner).

4.4.3. Development of Content and Courses

As a part of the programme development, different modules and courses have to be developed and existing courses may have to be adapted and re-organised. First, however, an overall aim of the programme has to be defined, and an overall structure concerning the delivery of courses has to be agreed upon. Generally, European Doctorates have 180 ECTS credits (although doctoral programmes are not officially defined by the

ECTS), consisting of theoretical courses, methodological courses and thesis related courses, summer schools and workshops (for example see the EuroDocs EDEEM, PHOENIX or NANOFAR) .

An interviewee recalls:

> *"We went through a list of the kinds of skills and knowledge that we expected the students of our doctorate either to have or to acquire"* (EuroDoc Partner).

Interviewees tended to say that a joint programme needs some common subjects and courses that are the same for all students. They say that it would be more *fruitful* if students share a *common understanding*, that there needs to be a *basic core programme* for all students and that there needs to be some *uniformity* in the teaching. As the development of common courses and/or collaborative courses can be very complex, interviewees were asked for some recommendations, how to deliver such courses.

One possibility to support the delivery of common courses are through the use of online technologies. Web-based courses and e-learning are named frequently by the interviewees.

> *"I think we'd have to look at innovative ways of doing that – you know – through using video conferencing, using podcasts, using on-line technology to support the delivery of teaching and – you know – to students"* (Professor).

Another way of delivering courses and information together is through intensive courses and summer schools.

> *"It's important to have, for example, the kind of summer schools where foreign or international experts visit and so on"* (Professor).

The interviewees that are currently either coordinating a EuroDoc or are part of a EuroDoc, said that the only common courses in their programmes are delivered through a summer school/intensive course every year, where students and teachers can come together.

Some interviewees also stressed the importance of having individual national courses, that focus on national structures and policies – to get "*a sense of your own country*" (Student) – and on the specialisation of the different institutes in specific methodologies, themes or theoretical approaches.

An important issue when developing the programme and (joint) courses is the language. Interviewees were asked how they would deal with the language issue in a European Doctorate and whether they thought students should be required to learn a second or third language in addition to English.

Generally, there was consensus that English should be the working language for a joint/ European PhD programme and that (most) courses therefore need to be delivered in English. At some universities it is already the case that courses are primarily taught in English and that many students write their PhD theses at least partly in English.

Most interviewees thought that introducing English as a working language would not raise any sort of problems; on the contrary, it could be an added value for some PhD students.

> *"Things like language hasn't been a problem – that wasn't a problem at all. It was a very minor issue"* (Partner EuroDoc).

"It may be that for students from non-English speaking countries that indeed [being taught in English] *could be helpful and useful to them"* (Professor).

Interviewees rarely thought that EuroDoc students should be required to learn another language besides English.

4.4.4. Mobility

Mobility of staff, but mostly of students, is an issue that has to be considered when developing a joint/European Doctorate. It concerns the travel and accommodation of students, the amount of time and the reasons for time spent abroad, as well as international supervision of students.

Concerning logistical issues, interviewees primarily stressed the costs for travel of staff and students. To get sufficient funding for the travelling of staff and students is seen as a challenge.

"I think the only question is how to fund travelling – travelling itself, that's nice for most of the people, but how to count the costs" (Professor).

Mobility for meetings, specifically the previously mentioned summer schools that all interviewed EuroDoc coordinators have talked about, is also perceived as a big challenge:

"Getting people together, really – I mean, we – the annual conference in which all the students registered on the programme are meant to participate is a feature which we have maintained throughout our PhD programme's life and that's a big logistical effort – getting everybody together – getting a time, planning a venue – but that's the biggest challenge, logistically" (EuroDoc Partner).

Interviewees thought that for a joint doctorate, students should be required to spend some time at other universities in other countries. The time range they suggested is between one month and one year; most interviewees thought that one or two semesters is an adequate time (6 months to one year). However, it is important to develop a clear idea about what student should do during their time abroad – whether they should spend the time generating data, attending courses, etc.

In some cases the issue of mobility may need to be dealt with in a flexible way. As some students (especially in Finland and Scandinavian countries) are already older when they start their PhD and often already have families, spending time away from home may be problematic for them.

"It depends very much on the student's situation because in Finland for example we have many students that start their PhD when they already have families and the average age of starting the PhD is high compared to other countries, but I think if the student is able to go, I think at least three months would be good" (Student).

Another decision that needs to be made is, whether students should be required to visit one or two universities during their time abroad.[4]

[4] Erasmus Mundus has clear requirements: students need to spend at least 6 months each at two universities (European Commission 2011).

"Well, if it's one year, I think it would always be better if it's two universities, but I know that in practice it's difficult to organise, but it's always better to have experiences of more than one or two universities" (Coordinator international doctorate).

Interviewees also talked about the issue how to accommodate students during their time abroad and how to organise (and pay for) accommodation.

Related to the mobility of students is the issue of international supervision and co-supervision. Supervision, in turn, has to be seen before the background of the diverse structures and traditions of doctoral studies in Europe – students and professors have different definitions and expectations what supervision of a thesis implies.

"The challenges are that the level of supervision given to PhD students varies greatly from institution to institution and what is expected of supervisors varies greatly and what students can expect and it is often difficult to try and co-ordinate this. I mean, in the UK we tend to give much closer supervision to PhD students – much more supervision than in some other countries" (EuroDoc Partner).

Therefore, as mentioned earlier, clear guidelines and indicators for supervision have to be developed.

Some interviewees already had experience with international supervision and said that a lot can be done through online media (email, skype), as long as there are some face-to-face meetings for crucial events during the students' studies:

"I think it's not enough when you use Internet only – that is quite difficult. I think it works if you see the student – have a meeting with the student face-to-face in the beginning, in the planning stage, but really it needs a starting meeting together, in my opinion" (Professor).

For different supervisors to be able to work together in a productive way, it is recommended that the people should already know each other, have worked together previously and therefore know each other's' ways of working. Communication between the supervisors, not only the student and the supervisors, is important in this context too.

5. Conclusion

Four important themes were identified in the interviews and written replies of this scoping study: first, the benefits – general, for students, and for universities and researchers – of establishing a joint doctorate, as well as its limitations and alternatives; second, the core learning outcomes of a joint doctorate in HP and PH; third, the necessary requirements that need to be in place before the development of the doctorate – ranging from the network of partners, a shared vision, a coordinating body, support and commitment of the participating universities, as well as time and experience; and finally, the necessary steps and decisions that need to be made to develop a joint doctorate, which are the securing of funding, the development of agreements and definitions, the development of the programme as well as its courses, and decisions concerning the mobility of students and staff.

This scoping study has some limitations that need to be discussed in the context of its results. The study was carried out as a small scale study – only 9 interviews and two written responses were collected, during a data generation phase of only 2.5 months. Due to the limited time and limited resources it was not possible to interview more stakeholders – especially PhD students who turned out to be a hard to reach group. It can be argued that more responses (interviews and written responses) from different stakeholders could have provided more in-depth information. However, for the central themes data saturation was reached.

5.1. Next Steps and Recommendations

As has been shown in the Results, the establishment of a joint doctoral programme is a highly complicated and complex process that can face many challenges and bureaucratic problems. Within the literature and through the qualitative scoping study some of these important decisions and first steps have been identified:

First, the decision has to be made, what sort of joint/international/collaborative doctorate should be established. As described, there are a few alternatives ranging from a simple database/ pool of courses that are made available for all PhD students, as suggested by several interviewees; setting up individual dual-degree programmes; to the establishment of a joint degree. Depending on this decision, a general vision for and a conceptualisation of a doctorate in the fields HP and PH have to be developed. This includes the crucial question, how HP and PH relate to each other, and what the focus of the doctoral programme should be.

Second, the decision has to be made at each of the interested universities, whether they can commit to the development of the programme, and one of the universities has to commit to taking over the coordination of the network. In order to establish a joint doctoral degree, at least three European universities have to fully commit (European Commission 2011, de Rosa 2008).

In their study about international postgraduate studies, Delgado et al. (2010) have developed a set of requirements for the establishment of joint degrees. They firstly stress the necessity to create a strong and committed consortium with a clear coordination structure. Similarly to the results of this scoping study, they say that this network of partners needs to be able to make decisions about the type of programme and its main features, principles, and content. The role of the coordinator is crucial, as peer decision-taking processes need to be enabled and responsibility for the programme implementation needs to be taken (Delgado et al. 2010).

Third, an agreement between the universities has to be set up, the programme has to be developed (both the administrative structure as well as the content) and funding has to be secured. This third step entails much work of all the participating institutes, but especially the coordinating body. It includes making final decisions about the content of the programme (including the learning outcomes of students), developing and/or adapting courses, defining supervision and mobility of staff and students, reaching agreements on tuition fees and the appropriate time for students to be abroad, and much more. For this, it is necessary to analyse rules and regulations of every involved institution and nation (Delgado et al. 2010). Delgado et al. (2010) say that it is necessary to have a central administrative unit that takes care of commonly agreed rules and regulations. As many institutions have irregularities in issuing ECTS credits, foreign students frequently have problems getting the right credits for their work (Cippitani and Gatt 2012) – therefore, a clear transfer system has to be in place for a collaborative or joint doctorate (de Rosa 2010).

Concerning the thematic programme, Delgado et al. (2010) stress that it needs to be innovative, address real needs and be up to date. As doctoral studies are on the borderline between original research and organised academic training, it is much harder to formalise the content of the programme than it is for undergraduate studies (Önnersfors 2007). Most crucially, however, the programme needs a clear shared vision that all the partners can commit to, which is in accordance to what interviewees have said in this study.

Delgado et al. (2010) furthermore say that academic staff that will be involved in the doctoral programme needs to be chosen well. Staff should be experienced with working internationally and with international students and researchers.

There are several challenges that have to be overcome along the way, most based on the fact that there is such great heterogeneity and diversity within doctoral studies and university structures in Europe. Issues like development of indicators, development of joint courses, the tuition fees for students, and entry requirements for students are all heavily influenced by the structures of the participating institutes and therefore have to be carefully and transparently negotiated. Difficulties to establish collaborative and joint doctorates mostly centre on national laws and norms that are difficult to overcome (de Rosa 2008). There are many legal obstacles, like the recognition of the degree in all countries. Furthermore, there are differences in the financial policy and economic conditions in the different countries and institutions involved.

Another challenge that cannot be overlooked in this context is the collaboration of many different institutes and personalities that each have their own traditions, cultures and aims for the programme. Cippitani and Gatt (2009) describe that a problem with any joint degree is that the programme can falter or may not be of the quality and standard for one or more of the participating universities.

Recommendations concerning these decisions are to be as transparent, structured and well-defined as possible, and to support and foster commitment. If a joint programme is developed, the coordinating institution has the crucial role to prepare the basis of decisions and include committed partners in the actual decision processes. This is important for ownership on the one hand, and to assure compatibility of the programme on the other hand. Therefore, communication between the participating institutes and stakeholders is crucial.

6. References

Bergen Communiqué (2005) The European Higher Education Area – Achieving the Goals. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Bergen

Berlin Communiqué (2003) Realising the European Higher Education Area. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Berlin

Bologna Declaration (1999) Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education. The European Higher Education Area.

Braun, Virginia and Clarke, Victoria (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3:2, 77-101

Bryce, C.F.A, Aghion, P., Bos, F., Celada, M., Griffin, M., and Hull, R. (2004) European Doctorate in Biotechnology. Added Value for European Academia and Industry. Biochemistry AND Molecular Biology Education, 32(5), 352-357

Chopra, Mickey, Galbraith, Sarah, Darnton-Hill, Ian (2002) A Global Response to a Global Problem: the Epidemic of Overnutrition. Bulletin of the World Health Organisation, 80(12), 952-958

Cippitani, Roberto and Gatt, Suzanne (2009) Legal Developments and Proglems of the Bologna Process within the European Higher Education Area and European Integration. Higher Education in Europe, 34(3-4), 385-397

Collin, Jeff (2012) Tobacco Control, Global Health Policy and Development: towards Policy Coherence in Global Governance. Tobacco Control, 21, 274-280

Coltart, Cordelia E.M., and Gilmore, Ian T. (2012) The Need for a Global Alcohol Strategy: 'Upscaling the Issue in a Downstreaming Environment' Clinical Medicine, 12(1), 29-34

De Rosa, A.S. (2008) New Forms of International Cooperation in Doctoral Training: Internationalisation and the International Doctorate – One Goal, Two Distinct Models. Higher Education in Europe, 33(1), 3-25

De Rosa, A.S. (2010) Internationalization of Collaborative Doctorates and Joint European/International Doctorates: Requirements and Guidelines for Each Distinct Model. In: Agnieszka Klucznik-Törő, Krisztina Bódis, István Kiss Pál (2010) International Conference and Workshops on Higher Education, Partnership & Innovation Proceedings of the IHEPI2010, Budapest 6-8 September 2010

Delgado-Serrano, M.M., Gomez-Bruque, J.L., Ambrosio-Albala, M.J. and Llamas-Moreno, B. (2010) Understanding international postgraduate studies. Drivers from the supply and the demand side. Communications in Agricultural and Applied Biological Sciences 75(1), 187-198

Dempsey, C., Battel-Kirk B., Barry M.M. and the CompHP Project Partners (2011), The CompHP Core Competencies Framework for Health Promotion. IUHPE, Paris

EDEEM - European Doctorate in Economics Erasmus Mundus http://erasmusmundus-edeem.univ-paris1.fr/programme/study-program/

EHEA (1999) The Bologna Declaration, European Higher Education Area http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna.pdf

EUA (2007) Doctoral programmes in Europe's universities: achievements and challenges. Report prepared for European universities and ministers of higher education. European University Association

European Commission (2011) Erasmus Mundus 2009-2012. Programme Guide for the attention and information of future applicants and beneficiaries. Version December 2011 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/documents/2012/em_programmeguide_dec2011_en_new.pdf

Forbes, Ben and Lehr, Claus Michael on behalf of the GALENOS Network (2005) GALENOS Euro-PhD in Advance Drug Delivery: an innovative European Postgraduate Certificate for Young Pharmaceutical Scientists, funded by the EU Marie Curie EST Programme. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 60, 315-316

Higgs, Joy and Edwards, Helen (2002) Challenges facing Health Professional Education in the Changing Context of University Education. British Journal of Occupational Therapy, 65(7), 315-320

IUHPE (1999) The Evidence of Health Promotion Effectiveness: Shaping Public Health in a New Europe. A Report for the European Commission by the International Union for Health Promotion and Education.

Jeffery, Amanda and Elegbe, Olumide (2011) Scoping Study: Developing a European Doctorate in Health Promotion & Public Health. Draft Report, Submitted to: The International Health Development Research Centre, University of Brighton

Kehm, Barbara M. (2004) Developing Doctoral Degrees and Qualifications in Europe: Good Practice and Issues of Concern – A Comparative Analysis. In: Sedlak, Jan (ed) Doctoral Studies and Qualifications in Europe and the United States: Status and Prospects. Bucharest, UNESCO CEPES

Kehm, Barbara M. (2007) Quo Vadis Doctoral Eduacation? New European Approaches in the Context of Global Changes. European Journal of Education 42(3), 307-319

Kersten, H., Bearn, D., Gundersen, S., Holbrook, P., Kotsanos, N., Radnai M., and Virtanen, J. (2010) Proposed requirements for a European Doctorate in Dentistry: a discussion document prepared by a special interest group under the auspices of the Association for Dental Education in Europe. European Journal of Dental Education, 14, 35-42

King, Abby C., and King, Diane K. (2011) Physical Activity for an Aging Population. Public Health Reviews, 32(2), 401-426

Labonte, Ronald (2011). Toward a post-Charter Health Promotion. Health Promotion International, 26(2), ii183-ii186

Liang, W., Feng, L., Xu, C., Xiang, N., Zhang,Y., Shu, Y., Wang, H., Luo, H., Yu, H., Liang, X., Li, D., Lee., C.-K., Feng, Z., Hou, Y., Wang, Y., Chen, Z., and Yang, W. (2012) Response to the First Wafe of Pandemic (H1N2) 2009: Experiences and Lessons learnt from China. Public Health, 126, 427-436

Lisbon European Council (2000) Lisbon European Council Presidency Conclusions

Mackay, J. (2012) The Global Epidemiology of Tobacco and related Chronic Diseases. Public Health, 126, 199-201

Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Brazil, France, Indonesia, Norway, Senegal, and Thailand (2011) Why we need a Commission on Global Governance for Health. The Lancet, 379,1470-1471

NANOFAR – European Doctorate in Nanomedicine and Pharmaceutical Innovation http://www.erasmusmundus-nanofar.eu/

Narayan KM, Ali MK, del Rio C, Koplan JP, Curran J, (2011) Global noncommunicable diseases--lessons from the HIV-AIDS experience. The New England Journal Of Medicine, 8, Vol. 365, Issue 10, 1533-4406

Neuhauser, Linda, Richardson, Dawn, Mackenzie, Sonja and Minkler, Meredith (2007) Advancing Transdisciplinary and Translational Research Practice: Issues and Models of Doctoral Education in Public Health. Journal of Research Practice 3(2), Article M19

Önnersfors, Andreas (2007) From Scientific Apprentice to Multi-skilled Knowledge Worker: changes in PhD education in the Nordic-Baltic Area. European Journal of Education 42 (3), 321-333

Park, Chris (2005) New Variant PhD: The changing nature of the doctorate in the UK. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 27(2), 189-207

Prague Communiqué (2001) Towards the European Higher Education Area. Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of Higher Education, Prague

PHETICE (2008) Public Health Training in the Context of an Enlarging Europe. Final Technical Report. Karolinska Institutet.

PHOENIX - Phoenix JDP Dynamics of Health and Welfare http://www.phoenix-jdp.eu/

Speller, V., Parish, R., Davison, H., Zilnyk, A., and the CompHP Project Partners (2012). The CompHP Professional Standards for Health Promotion Handbook, IUHPE, Paris

Tauch, Christian (2004) Almost Half-time in the Bologna Process – Where Do We Stand? European Journal of Education, 39(3), 275-288

Taylor, John (2008) Quality and Standards: The Challenge of the Professional Doctorate. Higher Education in Europe, 33(1), 65-87

University of Ottawa (2008) Cotutelle Doctoral Program Policy. Adopted by the Senate of the University of Ottawa: http://www.grad.uottawa.ca/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=rT1bvpBZMsg%3d&tabid=3763

University of Vienna (not dated) Cotutelle de these: http://doktorat.univie.ac.at/en/prospective-doctoral-candidates/cotutelle-de-these/

Vincent-Lancrin, Stephan (2006) What is Changing in Academic Research? Trends and Futures Scenarios. European Journal of Education, 41 (2), 169-202

APPENDIX

I. Interview Questions

Part 1: Content of the EuroDoc

1) Do you think a European Doctorates (for HPPH) is important or necessary?

(only for HP PH experts)

2) In your opinion, what should the core learning outcomes of a EuroDoc HPPH be? What should the core qualifications of a EuroDoc HPPH graduate be?
3) Have you ever considered coordinating and developing a European Doctorate for HP PH yourself?

Part 2: Development of a EuroDoc

Do you have any experience with the development or organisation of a European Doctorate?

4) Which steps would you say are necessary to develop a EuroDoc (for HP and PH)?
5) What are the biggest challenges in developing and establishing a European Doctorate (in HP)?
6) What kind of funding streams do you know of for the development of a EuroDoc?

Part 3: Benefits and Limitations of a EuroDoc

7) What would you say are the biggest benefits and biggest limitations in a European Doctorate Programme (in HP)?
8) What are the key benefits and outcomes for students who would undertake an international Doctorate Programme (in HP)?
9) What are the key benefits and outcomes for universities who would establish an international Doctorate Programme (in HP)?

Part 4: Organisation and practicalities of a EuroDoc Programme

As part of the scoping study we would like to identify any recommendations and feedback, concerning its development and organisation.

10) What do you think is an appropriate ratio of time for a student to spend between the home and host institutions, provided that a period of study abroad is required?
11) What are the core challenges of international supervision and do you have any recommendations for this?
12) What are the core challenges of jointly developing and delivering coursework? Do you think this is an important part of a collaborative doctoral programme?
13) How could linguistic issues be addressed, and what to what degree (if any) should students be required to learn/research/communicate in a second language?
14) What are the key logistical issues that you have faced/might face, and what mechanisms did you use/could you use to overcome them?
15) Do you have any recommendations for ongoing collaboration between institutions?
16) Do you have any recommendations concerning tuition fees?

General:

Do you have any other recommendations or comments?

II. Funding Streams

For Universities:

- **Erasmus Mundus:** Action 1b: Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate Programmes (EMJD) – includes scholarships (may not be continued, as Erasmus for All has been introduced in November 2011)
  http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/2012/call_eacea_42_11_en.php
- **Erasmus for All** (starts 2014): A new proposal that is currently under discussion by the Council and the European Parliament and would bring together all existing EU and international schemes for education, training, youth and sport – including Joint degree grants, student and staff mobility and Higher Education grants.
  http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/
  Part of Education & Training is **ERASMUS multilateral projects** that support cooperation of higher education institutions.
  http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/multilateral-projects_en.htm
- **Marie Curie Initial Training Networks** (ITN)

  http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/mariecurieactions/itn_en.html
- **Marie Curie International Research Staff Exchange Scheme** (IRSES)

  http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/mariecurieactions/irses_en.html
- **Research Councils UK** – Funding international collaboration
  http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/international/funding/collaboration/Pages/home.aspx

For individuals (students, teachers, researchers)

- **Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowships for career development** (IOF) – for post docs and researchers
  http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/mariecurieactions/iof_en.html
- **Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships** (IIF) – for post docs and researchers

  http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/mariecurieactions/iif_en.html
- **Royal Society's International Exchange Scheme**: provides grants for scientific visits to and from the UK
  http://royalsociety.org/grants/schemes/international-exchanges/